

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE AGONIES OF IRELAND

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, there follows yet several more articles in the continuing series, "The Agonies of Ireland" which were published in December of last year by the Philadelphia Inquirer. Again, I commend them to my colleagues.

THE AGONIES OF IRELAND: THE ECONOMY
(By Michael Pakenham)

The economies of Ireland—North and South—are obstinately depressed. Modern industrial progress has passed them by. Their traditional sources of wealth have been left behind. They are suffering more acutely than any other major part of Europe from the present sustained recession.

The central agony of Ireland, historic and today murderously acute, is not economic. But any realistic hope for easing it in the short term, and ultimately for relieving it entirely, must involve achieving a substantial level of prosperity. That can be built only on a healthy, integrated economic foundation.

The prospect for that is disheartening.

Northern Ireland has the lowest average personal income, the highest proportion of families living on welfare payments, the highest unemployment and the worst housing conditions of any comparable region in all of Britain.

In the current fiscal year, the British government's expenditures for all services in Northern Ireland, excluding the cost of the military establishment there, is \$2.6 billion more than the total tax revenues generated in the province. Of the total \$425 million is attributed to nonmilitary security costs, principally to deal with terrorism. Additionally, British army costs in Northern Ireland are estimated at about \$190 million on an annual basis.

There are other large British expenditures, not included above, for special subsidies to troubled industries in Northern Ireland, including shipbuilding, which is severely depressed, and power generation.

Thus, British taxpayers outside Northern Ireland are paying something between 40 and 55 percent of the total government costs there. To raise local tax revenues to meet that would be impossible—to go half way would almost certainly ensure economic collapse.

If the British left Northern Ireland tomorrow, taking their subsidies with them, could the Irish Republic absorb the cost of the six counties?

The republic also suffers greatly from the expense of terrorism. Generally accepted estimates are that it is spending \$140 million a year on anti-terrorist security services alone. The impact of violence in the north on overall Irish tourism has been dramatic and economically painful.

Perhaps some of that would be diminished by significant movement toward unification—short of precipitate British withdrawal—though that is highly debatable. The Provisional IRA has fought every move toward economic integration and is pledged to overthrowing the government in Dublin, so the security problem is not likely to disappear. And there is the additional problem of the restive paramilitaries of the Protestant community in the north, which would fight significant integration today.

Still, consider it.

The Irish Republic's total government budget deficit in 1980 was \$1.12 billion, or 8.5 percent of its gross national product. For 1981, the deficit is expected to be \$2.27 billion, more than 14 percent of the GNP. Yet the GNP itself is rising at a rate of less than 1 percent annually.

Those figures, like similar ones in the United States, are in constant revision and flux. The basic truth of them is clear enough, however: The Irish Republic—like Britain—is in deep and deepening economic trouble. The Dublin government, with a massive balance-of-payments drain, mounting deficits and a stagnant economy, is borrowing huge amounts on international markets. The republic's total borrowing is near 20 percent of its GNP, while Britain's is about 4 percent. To pay for the local government deficit in Northern Ireland, even bringing levels of services down to those of the republic, the government in Dublin estimates, would require raising taxes in the south, across the board, by 25 percent.

In Northern Ireland approximately 115,000 persons are unemployed, 20 percent of the total work force. That is 25,000 more than a year ago. In 1974, total unemployment was below 30,000. It has been rising ever since, but especially sharply in the last two years.

In the Irish Republic the unemployment rate is at about 13.5 percent, far better than Northern Ireland's 20, but worse than Britain as a whole, which with three million workers jobless has an unemployment rate of somewhat more than 12 percent.

In all of Northern Ireland, unemployment among men is at about 24 percent and among women almost 14 percent. It is generally at its worst where sectarian violence is most intense: Men in Derry are 35 percent unemployed; in Newry, 37 percent; and in Strabane, 47 percent.

Official statistics are not kept as to religious affiliation. But independent studies of specific areas in the North have indicated unemployment among Catholics can be as much as 2½ times the regional average.

It is impossible to isolate causes of unemployment with precision, but economists attribute at least 27,000 of the 115,000 unemployment roll in the North to the direct effects of sectarian violence.

The dwindling of industrial production and employment in Northern Ireland, and in the Irish Republic, has gone on in spite of massive government efforts. Both offer phenomenal inducements for investment that would create jobs.

In Northern Ireland, a new company can receive up to 90 percent of its start-up costs in government grants for building, equipment, training and research and in loans

and tax advantages. On the average, the cost to the government of creating one new job under such programs in Northern Ireland is \$23,000. In the republic, similar incentives are running at more than \$8,000 per new job.

In the face of the grim figures, both the Irish Republic and Britain (including Northern Ireland) have elaborate and expensive social welfare programs. Comparisons are elusive because of variances in such things as scales for housing, rent and heat subsidies. But for a husband and wife, neither employed, with two children, the weekly government support payment is \$121 in Northern Ireland (and the rest of Britain) and \$88 in the Irish Republic. For an unemployed family with four children, it is \$170 in the North and \$105 in the South; with eight children, \$256 in the North and \$141 in the South.

As those figures indicate, the unemployed in the North are very substantially better off financially than those in the South.

The essence of the economics of the island is that both the North and South have enormously deficit-ridden government budgets, resting on desperate economic foundations.

Northern Ireland could not possibly pay its way as an independent nation, a course favored by some elements of its Protestant community. Under the hypothesis of unification, the economy of the South could not possibly replace the present British subsidies to the North. Even with elaborate and expensive transitional contributions by Britain and the republic, with additional aid from the European Economic Community and even the United States, the economic prospects are grim.

The most promising relief lies in Irish economic growth, largely through industrialization and other expanded income sources. It is unrealistic to believe that could happen in either the North or South in isolation from the other. Yet today, there is precious little of such integration.

One of the most perverse—but far from exceptional—examples of the economic barrier between North and South is in the field of energy. The island is a heavy importer of energy sources, with no coal or petroleum of its own. But in Northern Ireland a large excess of electric-generation capacity is going to waste. In the South, there is a natural-gas surplus, also going to waste. Both could benefit significantly by sharing those surpluses and needs. Yet the electricity link that was built to the South has been destroyed repeatedly by IRA terrorists, despite intense security efforts by both governments.

An editorial in the Nov. 5 Irish Times of Dublin put it well: "When a man in Ballyfermot can light his house with Kilroot electricity, and his counterpart in the Shankill Road can boil an egg using Kinsale gas, they are unlikely to find in these amenities any taint, respectively, of Orangeism or Popery. It may be a less glamorous way of uniting Ireland than councils and institutions, but it is one way of uniting Ireland all the same."

What's more, any other way that ignores or evades the economic challenges faced on the island of Ireland today is doomed to produce more misery, and with that more

strife. All constructive hope for the future of Ireland must take into account the necessity of economic progress—cooperatively.

THE AGONIES OF IRELAND: THE ALTERNATIVES

In conversations with serious, studious, responsible people whose lives and energies and devoted to—or simply involved in—trying to deal with the problem of the island of Ireland today, a single theme is always stated. "Anyone who isn't confused here doesn't really understand what's going on," is the way one Ulsterman puts it.

"Any fair-minded person will find it impossible to find a right and a wrong," are the words of a senior Irish diplomat.

"Anybody who thinks he has found a solution in which anyone wins has put together another disaster," is the way Garret FitzGerald, prime minister of Ireland, makes the point.

What does that mean?

It means there is no sure formula for a "solution" to the agonies of Ireland. Any enduring relief of today's woes will take time and uncommon courage, intelligence and good will to fashion. That will not be done tomorrow, or even in short years.

There can be no progress toward a long-range solution, however, without a thorough, dispassionate understanding of the difficulties. Vital to that is recognition of the realities of all major proposed "solutions" today. They are:

Direct rule from London. The present situation, prevailing since 1972, except for an interruption in 1973-74, with the principal executive powers of government exercised as a cabinet department of the British government, with voters in Northern Ireland represented by 12 members of the Parliament in London, and with limited local functions managed through local politicians.

Problems. It leaves British politicians, civil servants and military in charge, which is abrasive to most Catholics. It tends to leave Northern Ireland's problems at a low level of priority among those who are directly responsible. Northern Ireland contains less than 3 percent (1.6 million) of Britain's total population (57 million). Its concerns never have received high priority by a British Parliament, government or national political party. Without dramatic additional initiatives, direct rule does little to ease the polarization between Protestant and Catholic communities, while keeping a heavy, and utterly thankless, burden of administration and security on the British government. Direct rule could have been adapted to be more locally responsive. That could have led to:

Full unification with Britain. Favored by some powerful Protestant elements.

Problems. All of the present difficulties, amplified by the removal of hope for progress on behalf of the Catholic minority.

Immediate withdrawal of British troops and other security forces. The "Brits out—now" solution that could be ordered, technically anyway, by the British government.

Problems. A wide array of Protestant-based organizations, both legitimately political and secret paramilitary, state convincingly that they stand ready to rise up and take over the policing function as vigilantes, with particular targeting of Catholic paramilitaries and their "supporters." Almost all serious observers, on all sides, foresee that turning quickly into arbitrary, uncontrolled repression of Catholics with yet-unprecedented intensity and brutality—and then response in kind by Catholics. Many fear rapid escalation of that into civil war. The

Irish Republic does not have sufficient military forces to intervene, even if it chose to, which no significant political figure in Dublin favors.

Local majority rule. Re-establishment by the British government of a semi-autonomous (though heavily subsidized) Northern Ireland Parliament, with local sovereignty much like that of each state within the United States.

Problems. This was what existed until London suspended it in 1972. The primary reason for that suspension was sectarian discrimination. With more than one million Protestants and fewer than 500,000 Catholics in Northern Ireland, the democratically elected, Protestant-dominated local government controlled all executive functions, critically including policing, public employment, the electoral machinery and housing. With no voice in the executive branch of the government, many Catholics' fundamental civil rights were abused intolerably. To return to that is unacceptable to all involved except the most repressive elements of the Protestant community, who caused the problem.

Power sharing. A major variation on local autonomy is for London to impose a form of local government, elected by proportional representation (in contrast to direct, winner-take-all balloting). That was instituted in 1973-74 under the Conservative government of Edward Heath, after what became known as the Sunningdale Agreement between the governments of the Irish Republic and Britain. Catholics were guaranteed a strong voice in the executive and control of substantial departments of governments. In tandem, a Council of Ireland, with participation by the governments of Northern Ireland, the Irish Republic and Britain, was promised but foundered.

Problems. Power sharing and the Sunningdale process broke down in the face of a massive Protestant workers' strike and the threat of widespread violence by Protestant militants who brought Northern Ireland to the brink of economic paralysis and social anarchy. If the Labor Party government that succeeded Heath's had been tougher, possibly it could have held together the powersharing executive and the Sunningdale process although there is genuine debate about whether anything would have held the Protestants in line. There is general agreement, however, that the Protestant reaction was precipitated more by the implication of motion toward unification with the republic in the Council of Ireland notion than by power sharing. Still, direct rule was reimposed. To impose power sharing today would be inflammatory to many of the most forceful political leaders of the Protestant community and to paramilitary forces, although working toward it by broad consent is a promising possibility—perhaps the most promising one in sight.

Independence for Northern Ireland. For the British Parliament to exclude the province from the United Kingdom.

Problems. To many, unilaterally expelling Northern Ireland from Britain would be as unthinkable as for the U.S. Congress to divorce California, although there is some political support for the idea among both Protestants and Catholics. Northern Ireland, however, is nowhere near economically self-sufficient. It is dependent on Britain for at least 40 percent—by some analyses, more than half—of all funding for its public services. If all that were overcome, independence still would leave unsettled all the present problems except the formal British presence.

Repartition. For the British government, with acceptance by the Irish Republic, to redraw the boundaries of Northern Ireland, putting predominantly Catholic areas into more homogeneously Protestant Northern Ireland.

Problems. Even theoretically, to be demographically effective, that would mean uprooting thousands of people or creating as many as a dozen enclaves of Catholics totally surrounded by Protestants, particularly a massive one in Belfast. Many mixed areas, especially the border county of Fermanagh, are almost evenly populated by Catholics and Protestants and would be indivisible. The likely effects of repartition would be to increase resentment and polarization with the offer of a false solution and to put off any hope for the ultimate federation or unification of the island by intensifying the sources of Protestant paranoia. A full-scale civil war, which only the paramilitaries want, could have the result of forcing repartition, but only after a bloodbath and vast violent uprooting of both Catholics and Protestants.

United Nations or other outside direct involvement. Entry of a foreign peace-keeping force as a substitute for the British military presence and local police so far as they are involved in dealing with terrorism.

Problems. There's considerable doubt of necessary support within the United Nations, even if all major elements in Northern Ireland agreed, which they wouldn't. If that were possible, there is no encouraging precedent for effective, sustained peace-making by outside forces in mixed communities—only as temporary buffers between clearly delineated combatants. Any outside policing force would face the danger of being targeted by the paramilitaries—the IRA, the Loyalist factions or both. Less direct help, in the forms of economic and conciliation efforts, by U.N. agencies, the European Economic Community or even the United States could be valuable, but would not directly confront the problems of violence or its economic and political impact.

Unification with the Irish Republic—now. This could be achieved by the British and Irish Parliaments.

Problems. The firm position of the governments of the Irish Republic and the United Kingdom was articulated most recently in the official communique issued at the conclusion of the Nov. 6 meeting between Irish Prime Minister Garret FitzGerald and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. It said the two governments "agreed that any change in the constitutional status of Northern Ireland would require the consent of a majority of the people of Northern Ireland."

Unification with the Irish Republic—long range. The majority of politicians and opinion leaders in the Irish Republic favor this—as do many, in increasing numbers, in Britain, at least privately.

Problems. Everyone in authority in both countries is aware of the potentially explosive opposition of most of Northern Ireland's Protestants. FitzGerald has begun a process of working toward reconciling Northern Ireland's Protestants to begin to consider the ultimate prospect of unity. There is tentatively encouraging support for that from some British politicians. FitzGerald's strategy includes plans to seek amendment of the Irish Constitution to make the laws of the republic less reflective of Catholic Church dogmas and strictures (e.g., divorce is illegal in the Irish Republic) in an effort to woo Protestants of the north

toward gradual acceptance of the idea of unification—toward the “consent” to which both governments are committed. This is, at best, a long and painful process, perilously susceptible to being derailed by demagogues.

There can be no serious doubt today that the island of Ireland, and all who live on it or love it from afar, would be far better off if it were unified and at peace. Between present agonies and that idea, however, stand dreadful problems that for time beyond counting have defeated earnest men and women and have nourished demagoguery, exploitation, hatred and terrorism.

If peaceful unification is to come, it must come through consent of the majority of citizens of Northern Ireland—and thus at best it would require a painstaking, step-by-step program of reconciliation and accommodation. There are a dozen or more devices that, if properly and responsibly applied, could lead toward that. All involve increasing the interrelationships between the disparate peoples of Northern Ireland and those of the Irish Republic in economic, social, legal and political ways.

Gradually, then, a foundation could be laid for broad acceptance of some form of political federation, confederation or condominium of power. There, and there alone, lies the road to a fully unified, independent and peaceful Ireland. If that is to come about, it will require peace, resolute good will—and a generation or more of patience.●

NATURAL GAS DECONTROL

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I recently became aware of the possibility that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission may attempt to immediately deregulate the price of natural gas via an administrative ruling. To say the least, I was shocked that such an important and controversial move would be made without congressional approval. We have all heard what such an action might mean in terms of a consumer's monthly gas bill, and that concern is particularly important in my district in Michigan. Michigan is currently dealing with more economic problems than it can handle. Unemployment is and has been so high that our State now owes in excess of \$1 billion to the Unemployment Trust Fund. How can the people of Michigan survive even greater gas bills?

When the Congress partially decontrolled natural gas in 1978, there was a bitter and divisive debate. I am sure none of us want to repeat that performance, but I for one do not want to see that FERC rule without any consultation with the Congress. It is just too important an issue, with wide ranging interest across the Nation. If we are to deal with the issue of accelerated decontrol of gas prices, let us do it in a manner where the voice of all Americans can be heard. Let us not

leave the consumer and the businessman out of the debate.

I understand that a resolution has been introduced in the Congress which will send a warning to the FERC. I plan to become involved in that process, so that the FERC is aware that its actions are being closely monitored. I would urge my colleagues to do likewise.●

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO RESTORE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ELIGIBILITY TO EX-SERVICEMEN

HON. DON BAILEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will restore unemployment compensation eligibility to ex-servicemen and women. Senator BILL BRADLEY has introduced this measure in the Senate and I am proud to be the sponsor of his bill in the House.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House passed a bill last December 15 that included my amendment to restore unemployment compensation eligibility to ex-service personnel. That amendment was slightly different from the language of this measure today. That House-passed bill, however, now languishes in the Senate Finance Committee. I invite my Senate colleagues to begin, in earnest, consideration of that UCX language. The current law, enacted in the President's Omnibus Reconciliation Act last year, is, as I have said before, unfair to the thousands of men and women who have served this country with honor and distinction. When they have completed their tour of duty, these men and women are not extended any help in finding employment in the private sector. Instead, the administration has chosen to pressure them into reenlistment. Their refusal to accept an offer to reenlist leaves them with nowhere to turn.

Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, Secretary of Labor Raymond Donovan honestly and forthrightly admitted that the motive behind the administration's change last year was to deny free choice to servicemen approaching the completion of their enlistment; to force servicemen to choose reenlistment because of difficulties in finding employment in the private sector. I congratulate Secretary Donovan for being the first in the administration to admit the true motives behind the President's change in UCX. Clearly the more basic fear underlying their policy is that the volunteer service must not be working. Of course, we know that re-

tention is a problem. But, I respectfully and strenuously disagree that the way to increase the Armed Forces' reenlistment efforts is by refusing to extend assistance to servicemen who have honorably served and wish to return to civilian life.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, under current law a serviceman or woman who is discharged honorably and declines an offer to reenlist is denied eligibility for unemployment compensation. In contrast, a serviceman or woman who is not offered reenlistment because of reduction in force in his or her occupational specialty, and the individual who incompetently serves his country and is discharged less than honorably, are entitled to unemployment benefits. Thus, we are penalizing those individuals who serve their country well while we continue to provide benefits to those who are ineligible to reenlist. I believe we have our sense of fair play reversed.

The bill I have introduced today, as well as the amendment I authored in December to the House-passed bill, correct both the anomaly that exists in current law and, I believe, restores a sense of fairness and equity to our servicemen and women. Under the bill I have introduced, individuals who have served honorably for 2 years and are unable to find employment in their transition to civilian life will be eligible for unemployment benefits. In addition, individuals who leave the service before serving 2 years due to hardship, service-incurred injuries, or who leave at the convenience of the service, will also be eligible for benefits.

Mr. Speaker, while the President is willing to trade equity for dollar savings, I believe our Nation's servicemen and women should be treated with the respect they have duly earned and given a helping hand when needed to assist them in the transition to civilian life. The administration's argument to the contrary, service personnel are not in comparable situations to those employed in the private sector and thus their discharge should not be viewed or treated as a voluntary quit. This bill recognizes those differences, as does the language that was passed by the House last December. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join me in supporting that amendment to H.R. 4961 by working to report the bill from the Finance Committee. And, I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in supporting the measure I am introducing today.●

STRANGERS IN THEIR OWN LANDS

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, as the wheels of the legislative process grind along, public interest and concern continues to grow over the plight of the Amerasian individuals. Because my colleagues may not have seen the edition, I have included for your review an article which appeared in the international issue of Time Magazine on December 14, 1981. Entitled "Strangers in Their Own Lands," this article is an accurate account of the discrimination and appalling circumstances Amerasians experience throughout their lives:

STRANGERS IN THEIR OWN LANDS

(By William Drozdiak)

"In the dead of night, I sometimes find myself wondering what I am," said Cha Mi Sun. For Cha, a 27-year-old Korean acupuncturist, the acute identity crisis began the day he was born. In school, his classmates derided him as a *twigi*, a half-breed. Later, he found that his patients loathed being touched by him because of his "outlandish" looks. Like thousands of other youths spawned by liaisons between American servicemen and Asian women, Cha has blue eyes and brown hair that brand him a pariah condemned to a life of shame and ridicule in his native land, proud of its long history of ethnic purity.

From Thailand and the Philippines to Japan and Korea, there are perhaps 170,000 such Amerasians. Viet Nam alone has an estimated 25,000 to 50,000, who represent one of the most poignant legacies of the U.S. involvement there. The victorious Vietnamese consider mixed-descent youths an unwelcome reminder of a hated foe. As a result, the Amerasians are denied education and rights of citizenship. In Thailand, a recreational playground during the war years, street urchins with names like Charlie and Woody often must survive by hustling coins from tourists and running errands for massage parlors.

"For those forgotten American children in Asia, life is just misery," says Father Alfred V. Keane, an American priest who runs a home for Amerasians in Inchon, Korea. "The harassment never seems to end. Sometimes they are beaten, stoned, kicked and reduced to a subhuman status in ways I could never begin to describe."

In some countries where an American presence has been tolerated for generations, Amerasians have attained a measure of acceptance. In the Philippines and Japan, where they were once scorned as "Madama Butterfly tots" or "souvenir babies," mixed-descent children have capitalized on their exotic looks and gained success in the entertainment and fashion worlds. Two of the most popular Filipino movie stars, Hilda Koronel and Elizabeth Oropesa, are daughters of American fathers. But in Korea, most Amerasian children and their mothers are still treated as outcasts. In the bars and discos near the military bases, where more than 37,000 U.S. troops are stationed, the underclass perpetuates itself in a sad cycle:

children of prostitutes who once plied their trade at the same bases now cater to another generation of American G.I.s.

Trapped between two cultures, Amerasians receive little sympathy from local governments. "Sometimes officials refuse to believe the children are Thai citizens because of the way the child looks," says Janjira Wongsopa, a medical counselor with the Pearl S. Buck Foundation, which aids more than 12,000 Amerasians in five countries. "They will put American or Negro as the nationality on the birth certificate, which means the child cannot attend a government school." Roughly 98% of Thailand's Amerasians (variously estimated to number between 4,000 and 11,000) are illegitimate progeny, many of them ostracized by their mothers' families. Says a Bangkok social worker: "That alone will deprive them of many job opportunities, which are often obtained through relatives or friends of relatives."

As elsewhere, the degree of Asian prejudice is often dictated by skin color. "In many ways the white Amerasian is better off," says Michael Nebeker, Bangkok director of the Pearl S. Buck Foundation. "Although he is teased, the Thais sometimes find his light hair and features exotic. But with blacks there is definitely maliciousness. Teachers call them 'nigger' in front of other kids and openly discuss how their mothers were just prostitutes and their fathers soldiers." Pearl S. Buck Foundation officials believe that every effort should be made to integrate the mixed-descent child into local society before adoption is contemplated. But the vicious treatment of Amerasian blacks has convinced Nebeker that for them, going to the U.S. might be the best thing.

Even if there is an American couple willing to adopt them, the peculiar status of Amerasian children often makes it impossible for them to emigrate. To qualify for adoption, a child is required by Thai law to have written consent from his mother, something many Amerasians find impossible to obtain since they were abandoned shortly after birth. In the Philippines, 99 percent of Amerasians are born out of wedlock and are thus considered Filipinos, which forces them to compete with some 300,000 other Filipinos who have applied for the 20,000 U.S. immigrant visas allotted to the Manila embassy.

The wrenching ordeal of the Amerasians has induced Representative Stewart B. McKinney, a Connecticut Republican, to propose a bill that would provide preferential admission into the U.S. for some of the children of American soldiers born abroad. Under McKinney's bill, an alien born in Korea, Viet Nam, Laos or Thailand after 1950 who was fathered by a U.S. serviceman on active duty would be granted high preference under U.S. immigration laws, provided that the child could prove American paternity and find a sponsor to guarantee financial support for five years. The bill languished in one previous Congress but is now picking up enough backers to stand a chance of passage. Says McKinney: "This act does not carelessly throw open the gates to allow mass immigration. It allows Amerasians the opportunity they deserve as sons and daughters of U.S. citizens."

Not all Amerasians would rush to apply for visas to the U.S. "A lot of the children are curious about their fathers," says a Pearl S. Buck Foundation worker, "but they are Thai and their lives will be here." Pearl S. Buck Foundation officials believe that an

offer of U.S. citizenship to Amerasians is a necessary first step in recognizing moral responsibility. Says Executive Director John Shade: "They are Americans. The Amerasians have more right to be citizens of this country than Cubans and Haitians." ●

SHRINERS LAUDED FOR PIONEERING CARE FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN

HON. L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1982

● Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed with pleasure that I offer this tribute to the Shriners of North America for their efforts on behalf of crippled children, and I salute those who have worked so diligently to build a Crippled Children's Hospital in Tampa, Fla.

These fine men have given generously of their time and their resources to provide medical care for those who can be helped and had little or no other opportunity for care.

The long-held dream of a Shriners' hospital in Florida, slated to open in 1984, is the culmination of the efforts of, among others, the Imperial Potentate of the Shrine of North America Mr. Randolph R. Thomas of Jacksonville, Fla.—the first Floridian to hold such a high office in this international organization, and a recent visitor to the Nation's Capital.

The philanthropic work of the Shriners spans more than six decades, beginning in 1921, when the membership made a commitment to develop and support an official philanthropy and subsequently formulated a concept that would become known as the "World's Greatest Philanthropy"—a network of hospitals to care for crippled children.

Since the first Shriners' Hospital for Crippled Children opened in Shreveport, La., in 1922, these medical centers have provided cures or substantial help to almost a quarter of a million children.

There are currently 18 orthopedic hospitals and 3 burn centers located throughout the country—with the 1984 completion of the Tampa center bringing the number to 19.

The Shriners' hospitals were among the first specialized orthopedic hospitals in North America and their pioneer efforts earned them the fine reputation they enjoy today. The real contribution—aside from the very important work with crippled children—is in the area of research and specialization. Today these centers have become major referral hospitals where among the most complicated orthopedic and burn cases are treated.

This Nation is truly blessed because of the contribution these men have

made to the betterment of mankind in the area of medical science, and I would like to take this opportunity—of the occasion of the visit of Imperial Potentate Randolph R. Thomas to the Nation's Capital—to laud the members of the Shrine of North America for providing the means to treat and cure the crippled children of America.

The humanitarian deeds will be reflected in the smiles and hearts of all children whose lives and well-being have been enhanced because the Shriners cared enough to give a helping hand. ●

A CHANCE TO CHANGE DIRECTION—THE NEED FOR A NUCLEAR FREEZE

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● **Mr. MARKEY.** Mr. Speaker, there is a growing movement in this country which Congress must begin to understand. That movement is the campaign for a nuclear freeze. Citizens across the country are beginning to realize that nuclear war is not an arcane subject to be left to experts to debate, but rather an issue that directly affects each and every one of us, and demands our attention.

I urge my colleagues to endorse the nuclear freeze, and to support efforts here in Congress to bring a halt to the senseless, unwinnable arms race. Recently, the Boston Globe ran an incisive editorial on the nuclear freeze, and I would like to submit that editorial in full for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE NUCLEAR FREEZE CAMPAIGN

A proposal for a bilateral agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to suspend the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons will be taken up at over 160 town meetings in Vermont.

A "mutual nuclear arms freeze" is the aim of a grassroots campaign catching on across the country. In California over 300,000 signatures have been gathered to place the freeze proposal on the ballot in November as a referendum item.

The immediate aim is not disarmament—not even nuclear disarmament, and certainly not "unilateral disarmament," which is the buzzword that "rearm America" advocates typically use to discredit arms control.

The notion will be found simple, direct and understandable by people normally intimidated by the arcane world of strategic weaponry. It is a logical first step to stop piling on more hardware that is only making a bad situation worse.

It is not "deep cuts" in existing arsenals, nor complicated negotiations of the sort now under way in Geneva. It is not to beat swords into plowshares, nor to renounce war as an instrument of foreign policy, nor even to pledge not to use nuclear weapons.

The resolution simply requests "the President of the United States to propose to the

Soviet Union a mutual freeze on the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and of missiles and new aircraft designed primarily to deliver nuclear weapons, with verifications satisfactory to both countries."

That radically simple notion—agreeing that enough is enough—is something that could be done, which is why the freeze campaign is an important phenomenon.

Unlike past efforts of the "peace movement," the freeze proposal is so modest in its aims and framed in such low-key language that it can appeal to conservatives and liberals. So far the proposal has drawn criticism mainly from the left, on the grounds that it does not go far enough to redirect military spending toward social goals.

The freeze organizers have chosen a slow-but-steady strategy to build up a political head of steam over three to five years. Given a careful approach of this sort, there is no reason to think that arms control cannot move from the fringe to the center of the American political agenda, in the same way that environmental concerns have.

Even if the US government adopted the freeze proposal as policy, and if the Soviet Union agreed in principle, the issue of "verification" (finding a way to assure each side that the other isn't cheating) would pose substantial difficulties.

These would not be overwhelming, however. If there is sufficient political will to solve them, they will be solved.

The freeze campaign is aimed at the simple, formidable and yet realistic goal of forging that will in the American public. ●

CANADIAN PROPOSAL COULD RESULT IN INCREASED ACID RAIN

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● **Mr. CORCORAN.** Mr. Speaker, I have recently become aware of an effort by a Canadian utility to sell more electricity to the United States, one effect of which would be greatly increased occurrence of acid rain. Ontario Hydro's plan to sell more electricity to the United States has been critically received, reported the February 5, 1982, Toronto Star. Critics include the Canadian Federal Environment Department and the Canadian Coalition on Acid Rain. They claim that the resulting increase in sulphur dioxide and nitric oxide emissions from Hydro's Nanticoke coal fired generating plant would create enough acid rain to kill 560 Ontario lakes. The Canadian Coalition of Acid Rain has noted the "hypocrisy of increasing acid rain emissions in Ontario, some of which fall in New England, while demanding of American citizens that they pay higher utility bills to cut powerplant emissions in the Midwest

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated before, I believe it is essential that the Congress fully consider the ramifica-

tions of any acid rain legislation before acting. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert the February 5 Toronto Star article in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Toronto Star, Feb. 5, 1982]

HYDRO'S ENERGY PLAN WOULD KILL 560 LAKES, CRITICS CHARGE

(By Peter Rickwood)

Ontario Hydro's plan to sell more electricity to the United States has come up against a wall of criticism.

Critics include the Federal Environment Department, which opposed the plan at National Energy Board hearings, and the Canadian Coalition on Acid Rain, which represents 28 organizations with a membership of 1.25 million people.

They say the resulting increase in sulphur dioxide and nitric oxide emissions from Hydro's Nanticoke coal-fired generating plant would create enough acid rain to kill 560 Ontario lakes and damage Canada's credibility in its protests against U.S. pollution.

The plan is "reprehensible and regrettable," Environment Minister John Roberts said yesterday.

The giant publicly owned utility is applying to sell electricity over a 10-year period to General Public Utilities of Parsippany, N.J., beginning in 1985.

Hydro's plan rests on approval from the NEB for a transmission line under Lake Erie.

The Ontario cabinet has cleared the way, after overturning an earlier requirement that Hydro had to install scrubbers on its generating plants to reduce emissions before exporting energy to the U.S.

That decision has put Canadian credibility at stake, the Canadian coalition's Washington-based lobbyist says.

"I can assure you that the credibility of the Canadian acid rain case (against the U.S.) could not withstand any decision that would permit this country to increase emissions that create acid rain," Adele Hurley told a press conference yesterday.

Canada has been trying to get the U.S. to control acid rain, and the coalition is about to launch a campaign to raise public awareness in the U.S., she said.

The U.S. produces about six times more acid rain than Canada, Hurley said. But U.S. legislators are considering tough new laws to control the emissions that cause it.

She said that last year Ontario Environment Minister Keith Norton had declared in Buffalo that he was declaring an all-out war on acid rain.

The province has testified in U.S. courts and at U.S. hearings to protest against plans by Midwestern utility companies that would increase acid rain emissions.

But Hydro's application has demonstrated that the matter of acid rain "appears to have lost some appeal with the Ontario cabinet," Hurley said.

Although Hydro's estimates of the increase in its emissions under the export proposals were challenged by Ottawa at the NEB hearings, there was no consideration of their political impact in the U.S., she said.

"The hypocrisy of increasing acid rain emissions in Ontario, some of which fall in New England, while demanding of American citizens that they pay higher utility bills to cut power plant emissions in the Midwest, is nowhere in the transcripts."

Hydro stressed the profits, she said, but, there is no guarantee that Ontario residents won't have to spend a dollar to save a dime.

The utility says it would reap \$1 billion profit from the scheme.

"We use the cleanest, cheapest and most efficient plants for ourselves," Hydro spokesman Richard Furness said yesterday. "Anything left is available to whoever wants to buy it."●

AMERICA NEEDS THE NORTHERN TIER PIPELINE MORE THAN EVER BEFORE

HON. RON MARLENEE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an article which recently appeared in the Chicago Tribune. I believe this article clearly emphasizes that with increasing turbulence in Central America our access to vital energy resources is in increasing jeopardy. America has to have more control over its energy supply. That is why we need the Northern Tier pipeline more than ever before.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 22, 1982]

OPEC'S ALLY IN NORTHWEST

(By Bob Wiedrich)

The State of Washington is the best ally the OPEC countries have in the United States.

For two years, that state has been stonewalling construction of the Northern Tier Pipeline Co., a transportation system vital to making the nation secure from the use of foreign oil as a political weapon.

If the environmentalists living there have their way, the growing resources of Alaskan oil will be denied large areas of the country. And Americans will remain vulnerable to the vagaries and manipulations of international oil barons.

That is the bottom line of the battle in which Northern Tier is locked with Washington state officials as the \$2 billion project teeters on the brink of collapse.

The State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council has delivered its decision to Gov. John D. Spellman that the project's oil port and right-of-way be denied as environmentally hazardous.

And now, Spellman has to make up his mind whether to go along with the findings or take the more politically perilous course of overriding the recommendation.

"This project is too important to the national interest not to be built," asserts Thomas Kryzer, Northern Tier president. "It is too important to the economy and the energy security of the country."

"This project, probably more than any other, has enjoyed broader support from labor, agriculture, the National Governors Conference, two national administrations and bipartisan members of Congress."

Kryzer obviously has a vested interest. The consortium of companies proposing to build the pipeline from Port Angeles, Wash., to Clearbrook, Minn., already has invested \$50 million without turning a spade of earth.

Regardless, his words echo those of a growing number of state and national leaders who have recognized the necessity for making the U.S. independent of foreign intervention in its energy supplies.

Energy Secretary James B. Edwards is on record as endorsing the need for the pipeline.

Also, a bipartisan group of 18 House members has been joined by influential senators in asking that President Reagan mediate the dispute with the State of Washington in the national interest.

"We are not attempting to subvert states' rights," the congressmen wrote Reagan. "But a project that involves more than one state and interstate commerce needs an impartial observer like the President to mediate the conflict."

That plea has been reinforced in letters to the White House from Republican Sens. Ted Stevens of Alaska, assistant majority leader; Paul Laxalt of Nevada, one of Reagan's closest advisers, James A. McClure of Idaho, Energy Committee chairman, and William L. Armstrong of Colorado.

In addition, the governors of North Dakota and Minnesota, two of the five states through which the project would operate, have similarly addressed the President. Those states and Montana and Idaho already have authorized the pipeline construction.

Only Washington is thwarting the national interest, even in the face of its own state House Labor and Economic Development Committee, which recently endorsed the project.

If built, Northern Tier would deliver 933,000 barrels of domestic oil a day to 66 refineries in 21 Northern states representing 25 percent of all American refining capacity as far east as Buffalo, N.Y.

It would eliminate the costly journey taken by 500,000 barrels a day from the West Coast to the Gulf Coast, via the Panama Canal or around Cape Horn at the bottom of South America. And it would put an end to ridiculous suggestions that Alaskan oil be exported.

"The majority recommendation of the site evaluation council was an incorrect conclusion based on an incomplete record," Kryzer charged.

"The council refused to reopen hearings to receive testimony by the Army Corps of Engineers, Coast Guard, Environmental Protection Agency, and the Departments of Energy and the Interior that would have refuted allegations the project would present environmental hazards."

"The council ignored its own environmental impact statement that found the project to be environmentally compatible."

"With Central America already an explosive area and with control of the Panama Canal soon to pass from U.S. hands, Northern Tier becomes a vital transportation system for Alaskan oil free of foreign embargo or interruption."

"Certainly, such a project deserves a review before opponents attempt to write its obituary."●

ARLAND WILLIAMS: PROFILE IN COURAGE

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, the darkest tragedies that befall us often afford the greatest opportunity to exhibit what Abraham Lincoln so aptly referred to as "the better angels of our nature." The tragedy which befell the city of Washington last January 13, 1982, with the crash of the Air Florida jetliner also provided the world with a shining example of heroism. When the jet smashed into the dark, icy waters of the Potomac and sunk, only a handful of survivors, three women and three men, managed to struggle to the surface. Arriving 19 minutes later, a small Park Service helicopter whirled frantically overhead, its landing skids sometimes touching the water, dangling a life preserver to the freezing victims below, all of whom suffered serious injuries. Time after time, one of the victims, Mr. Arland Williams, refused the life preserver for himself and selflessly offered it to those with broken bones, who were clinging desperately to the river ice and pieces of wreckage from the jet's tail section.

Mr. Speaker, the Holy Scriptures (John 15:13) tell us that "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." There is an ever growing emphasis on self these days: self-fulfillment, self-awareness, self-indulgence, even a magazine called *Self*. But for Arland Williams "self" was not the highest value in life. He took to his heart the prayer of St. Francis of Assisi which reminds us that "it is in giving that we receive and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life."

Arland Williams denied "self" for the sake of strangers and gave them the most precious gift a person can offer—his very life so that others might live. Arland has reminded us magnificently that we, truly, are made in the image of God and are capable of acting accordingly.

In spite of their deep sense of loss, how proud his loved ones must feel about their hero. And what a beautiful welcome Arland surely received in heaven that January day when he was born once more, this time into eternal life.●

NATIONAL STUDENT LOBBY DAY

HON. RICHARD OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, thousands of students from across the country are in Washington today to protest the President's proposed financial aid cuts. I think this is great. I wish more Americans who will be harmed by the proposed budget cuts would take the time to let the administration and their elected representatives know their opposition to the devastating effects these cuts will have on American education.

The administration has proposed enormous cuts in the higher education area affecting both student assistance and other programs of importance to higher education. Not only will these cuts disrupt the education plans of millions of students, they will force the closing of many colleges, will impede the United States in its ability to compete effectively with Japan and Europe and provide a strong national defense. They are reversal of our country's longstanding commitment to making higher education accessible to all regardless of race, sex, or financial status of the parents.

According to Department of Education, the administration's proposed 1983 budget will reduce the number of students eligible for student financial aid programs by 2.9 million. Specifically, one million undergraduate students will be eliminated from the guaranteed student loan program; 700,000 students from the pell grant program; and 1.2 million from campus-based programs. Federal student financial assistance which had been growing in the recent past is now declining at the same time that the cost of attaining a college education is rising.

The New York State Higher Education Services Corp. has put together a summary of the administration's fiscal year 1983 budget for student financial assistance and a preliminary analysis of the effects of these proposed changes on New York. I'd like to share this information with my colleagues:

FISCAL YEAR 1983 BUDGET SUMMARY

I. GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM (GSL)

The Guaranteed Student Loan Program is coming under the heaviest fire because it is an entitlement program in which the federal government cannot control costs simply through the appropriations process. The administration will try to implement the changes to the GSL Program for the 1982-83 academic year. The Administration's six proposals affecting the GSL Program are:

1. *Proposal*—Eliminate graduate students' eligibility for regular GSL loans. They would still be eligible for the new Auxiliary Loans to Assist Students (ALAS). The annual loan limit under the ALAS Program would be raised to \$8,000. Students who re-

ceive ALAS loans must begin repayment of the 14 percent interest immediately.

Impact of Proposal—This is the most drastic proposal in the package and would cause a reduction of 85,000 Guaranteed Student Loans amounting to approximately \$325 million in loans guaranteed by the Corporation. It is difficult to estimate how many students will use the ALAS Program. This proposal would have an enormous impact on graduate students in terms of both cost and availability of loan capital. Overall, at independent colleges a significantly higher proportion of GSL funds are used for graduate study than at public colleges. The student who needs only \$5,000 (the current GSL maximum) will virtually eliminate the use of loan financing for doctoral work. In many parts of the country, lending institutions would be reluctant to make this type of unsubsidized loan because of the severe problems inherent in collecting such large amounts of interest.

2. *Proposal*—Make eligibility for loans totally need-based. This would involve simply eliminating the \$30,000 income cap below which the determination of expected family contribution currently need not be made.

Impact of Proposal—This option would affect almost entirely students enrolled in public colleges. Because of the higher budgets, there would be little effect of the consideration of an expected family contribution from families with incomes of less than \$30,000 for students enrolled in private colleges. The impact on public institutions would also be greater because they tend to enroll a larger percentage of independent undergraduate students who have been relatively unaffected by the changes made so far. This change could reduce loan volume by an additional 15 percent.

3. *Proposal*—Increase the 5 percent origination fee to 10 percent.

Impact of Proposal—The major effect of this proposal would be to raise the cost of the loans to the student borrowers by doubling the amount that is charged and paid to the federal government when the loans are disbursed. These amounts generally are deducted from the loan proceeds at disbursement time. Thus, the undergraduate student who needs \$2,500 to cover educational costs will receive less than \$2,250. Not only will \$250 be deducted for the federal government, but an additional amount for each agency's insurance premium will also be deducted. There is also likely to be some reduction in demand for loans because of this increase in price.

4. *Proposal*—Increase the interest rate on GSL loans to market rates two years after the student leaves school. The lending institutions would receive no special allowance. Thus, their only return on the GSL loans will be from the interest charged to students. The federal government operates a loan program for health professions students under which market rates are charged. Under this program the interest rate varies each quarter, and is 16 percent for the current quarter and was 19½ percent for the previous quarter.

Impact of Proposal—Assuming interest rates were increased from 9 percent to 14 percent two years after leaving school there would be approximately a 17 percent increase in total payments, and the monthly payments during the last eight years of repayment would increase by over 20 percent.

5. *Proposal*—Require that one-half of the insurance premium that is charged by guarantee agencies be paid to the federal government to help defray default costs. State

guarantee agencies charge an insurance premium which is used to pay their own administrative expenses and the portion of default expenses not covered by the federal government. The actual fee varies by the length of time that the student will be in school, but averages approximately 2.5 percent of the face value of the loan. The Corporation charges significantly less than the average, with an average fee of 1.1 percent.

Impact of Proposal—Costs to the agencies will not decline significantly because of the other changes that are being proposed. In fact, they may well, on a per loan basis, rise because the average loan will be significantly smaller and defaults can be expected to rise because of the more restrictive loan policies. Agencies will have little choice but to pass along the higher charges to the student borrowers. A 1 percent guarantee fee for a freshman student amounts to approximately 4.5 percent of the total loan. When this is added to the 10 percent proposed origination fee, a student needing a \$2,500 loan will receive only \$2,138. (\$2,500 less total fees of \$362).

6. *Proposal*—Raise the insurance premium on Federally Insured Student Loans (FISL) to 1 percent from the current rate of ¼ percent. The federal government continues to operate the FISL Program directly with lending institutions to make loans available to groups of students who are not eligible to receive loans under the programs operated by state guarantee agencies.

Impact of Proposal—Although this proposal amounts to a quadrupling of the premium charged on loans directly guaranteed by the federal government, it will bring the rate up to the rate charged by most guarantee agencies, and double the amount charged by NYSHESC.

II. PELL GRANT PROGRAM

The fiscal year 1983 changes to the Pell Grant Program would not be felt until the 1983-84 academic year. This program is "forward funded", and the effects of program changes are somewhat delayed.

1. *Proposal*—Reduce the appropriation for the Pell Grant Program from the \$2.3 billion funding level in the current resolution for fiscal year 82 to \$1.4 billion in fiscal year 83. The maximum grant would be \$1,600 and the schedule of awards would be revised to meet the amount that is appropriated.

Impact of Proposal—This proposal would cut total funding for the program by 39 percent below the already reduced FY 1982 amounts. The Administration estimates that the average grant in 1983 would be cut to \$778 from the 1982 average of \$858. This means that the total number of recipients will be reduced from 2,550,000 in FY 1982 to 1,800,000 in FY 1983. Thus, three-quarters of a million students in the United States will lose their Pell Grants. The effect on New York will be a loss of over 85,000 grants amounting to slightly over \$110 million.

III. CAMPUS-BASED PROGRAMS

The campus-based programs, the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG), College Work Study Program (CWSP) and the National Direct Student Loan Program (NDSL) are also forward funded. Thus, these changes will not be felt until the 1983-84 academic year.

A. Supplemental educational opportunity grants (SEOG)

Proposal—The 1983 Budget does not request any funding for SEOG's.

Impact of Proposal—Nationwide, \$278 million will be lost for these grants. For New

York State schools this means a loss of funding of approximately \$22 million for 45,000 students.

B. College work study program (CWSP)

Proposal—Reduce funding for the CWSP Program from \$528 million in FY 82 to \$398 million in FY 1983.

Impact of Proposal—Nationwide there would be a loss of CWSP funds of \$130 million. The Administration estimates that the number of recipients will be reduced from 880,000 in FY 1982 to 720,000 in FY 1983, a loss of 160,000 student jobs. The effect on New York would be a loss of between \$10 and 11 million in funding and a loss of about 13,000 student jobs.

C. National direct student loans (NDSL)

Proposal—The 1983 Budget requests no new federal capital for the NDSL Program. Schools could continue to make loans from their revolving funds using the repayments on loans made in previous years.

Impact of Proposal—The elimination of new capital contributions to NDSL funds will eliminate the \$179 million that will be made available in FY 1982. The Administration estimates that this loss of funding will reduce the number of NDSL recipients from 800,000 in FY 1982 to 590,000 in FY 1983, a reduction of just over 200,000 borrowers. The effect on New York will be to reduce funding by approximately \$17 million and to reduce the number of borrowers by approximately 19,000 students.

IV. STATE STUDENT INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM (SSIG)

The SSIG Program was begun in 1972 to encourage state support for need-based grant programs.

Proposal—The program is being eliminated in 1983 because the Administration feels that it has met its goal of stimulating all states to provide need-based grants to post-secondary students.

Impact of Proposal—The SSIG Program will provide \$74 million to states in FY 1982 and none in FY 1983. The effect on New York will be the elimination of approximately \$6.6 million in funding which is used to help support the Tuition Assistance Program.

Cuts of this kind do not make sense for our country. We need skilled Americans if we are to compete successfully with other industrial nations. Ultimately, both the economic growth and security of our country depend on a trained and knowledgeable store of human talent. Why is this not obvious to this administration?

Federal support for education programs has been long-term and bipartisan until this administration. Now it is in great jeopardy. I strongly believe that education is one of the greatest investments this Nation can make in itself. I believe it is an investment that American taxpayers want to make. We in Congress must join together with the students here today and others around the country to fight the president's all-out assault on higher education which threatens the very future of this country.●

TARIFF AMBIGUITY

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● **Mr. VANDER JAGT.** Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 22, 1982, I introduced H.R. 5554 to correct a tariff ambiguity which has brought trade difficulties to importers of entertainment broadcast band clock radios. The summary of the proposed legislation, which appeared as an extension of remarks on the 22d of February 1982, contained a typographical error. My legislation suspends duties on entertainment broadcast band clock radios, except for those dedicated to use as automotive equipment, for a 3-year period, and thereby helps resolve an ambiguity relating to the proper classification of clock radios. This is done by segregating clock radios from other types of radio receivers. The bill provides for suspension of duty on that portion of the article not classifiable as a clock movement. The separate duty assessment on clock movements is not addressed and will not be affected by passage of the bill.

The duty suspension applies only to imports from column 1 countries entered, but not finally liquidated, on or after 1 year prior to the date of enactment, not 90 days as earlier written. There is no U.S. manufacturer of clock radios as classified under this legislation. The bill would benefit the consumer by offsetting inflationary pressures on clock radios prices, and at the same time would not harm U.S. industry.●

ALL IS NOT WELL IN URUGUAY

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● **Mr. LELAND.** Mr. Speaker, contrary to the assertions of our Department of State, all is not well in Uruguay. The government of President Alvarez, which took power in September of last year, has in no way shown an improvement in its record on basic freedoms and human rights. At hearings before the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House last September 15th, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State William Bosworth expressed his satisfaction with President Alvarez' commitment to "a restoration of the democratic system, and human rights and liberties—the rights of people to inform themselves freely and to decide who should represent them in the political parties and in the future government."●

Mr. Speaker, this flies in the face of reality. Within days of that hearing, the three editors of the Uruguayan periodical, "La Democracia," published by the traditional National Party (Partido Blanco), were arrested for having published an article on those same hearings held in the House of Representatives. The Uruguayan Government then repeated its attack on the free press last month, ordering "La Democracia" closed for 2 months because it published an article by "outlawed" political leader Carlos Julio Pereyra, Presidential candidate of the Blanco party in 1971. The article which brought about this blatant censorship of free press was about Uruguay's agrarian problems: it spoke only about the high prices of rural land and the danger of speculation by foreigners.

Mr. Speaker, let the record demonstrate that such are the results of our present administration's defense of human rights through "silent diplomacy."

Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Juan Raul Ferreira, president of the Uruguayan Convergencia Democratica/CDU, on these attacks on freedom of the press in Uruguay. I would also like to include an English translation of Mr. Ferreira's article.

[Press release]

**CONVERGENCIA DEMOCRATICA PROTESTS
ATTACKS ON FREEDOM OF THE PRESS**

Convergencia Democratica protested today the close down of moderate weekly newspaper, La Democracia, in Uruguay. The newspaper was issued by the National Blanco Party, one of Uruguay's two traditional parties.

The information was received only two days after the U.S. Congress had held hearings on the situation in Uruguay. At the hearings, the State Department pointed out that there was more freedom of the press in Uruguay. Even a Convergencia witness at the hearings said that it was encouraging that "in spite of great difficulties and pressures, the two traditional parties are printing their weekly newspapers".

Convergencia President, Juan R. Ferreira, said today:

"This is a good example of the kind of political opening the Government is talking about. This is the kind of freedom and respect for human rights that the new Government in Uruguay is trying to introduce. There have been two cases of death under torture in the past week. "La Democracia" was closed down and the edition of Argentine newspaper "El Clarin" was confiscated because it reported about the Tuesday hearings on Uruguay".

Mr. Ferreira ended up by saying:

"The dictatorship of General Alvarez tried to silence an opposition voice but this attack on our freedoms will be a new challenge for the democratic forces in Uruguay that will finally overcome and will restore the country to a democratic regime".

(September 18, 1981, Washington, D.C.)

[Article of "La Democracia" by Carlos Julio Pereyra]

URUGUAY: THE LAND AND THE SOVEREIGNTY

There is a consensus today among the Uruguayan people as to the magnitude and severity of the land and livestock crisis. This problem does not lend itself to an extensive investigation here, but it does leave itself open for a full discussion, which is the intent of this article with reference being of our lands under present circumstances and the sovereignty of the country.

LAND AVAILABILITY AND PRICES

It is known that, as a consequence of the land crises, there is today a large quantity of land for sale. The abundance of land and the lack interest on the part of the Uruguayan people to continue or initiate activity which brings little or no profit has caused land prices to fall at an increasing rate over the last couple of years. Land which sold for 700 to 800 dollars per hectare today cannot be sold for even half that price. We know of definite and numerous cases in which these lands were even being offered at anywhere from 180 to 250 dollars an hectare depending upon the quality of the soil making it very difficult for any transactions to take place. Nevertheless, what may be impossible for an Uruguayan farmer can appear quite attractive to a foreign speculator. It would be very difficult, if not altogether impossible, to find land of similar quality any cheaper. It is also a known fact that land is always desirable as it is an element integral to the survival of mankind and which therefore becomes in both the long and the short run, the safest investment. No matter what is said, land will always be a factor of fundamental wealth. It is obvious that the Uruguayan farmers cannot remain in a position waiting, hoping for things to change. The capitalist speculators, however, can.

CONSEQUENCES OF FOREIGN PURCHASES OF LAND

For countries of great territorial expansion, the problem cannot get any worse. In fact it may be unnoticeable, or it may even become a positive factor. However, in underdeveloped countries of small population, the problem can become extremely serious if it implies an introduction of modern technology to production techniques and the settling of people inspired by the necessity to establish themselves on land, having decided to stay as a consequence of their needs, to put the land to productive use, or as a consequence of underdevelopment. This may have been what took place in the case of the Uruguayan immigration, which occurred in the last century, accelerating rural progress. However, it is absolutely not the case with the corporations which would buy land as a result of the speculative fever. The Uruguay of today is comparatively smaller than the Uruguay of the last century; back then its land was semi-desert and poorly developed. Once it was settled, techniques of production improved. Today, the population is much more dense and our needs much more demanding of the land. The land is still our only wealth, not as a source of oil, but as a grand producer of food. If this is the case, can we remain passive in view of the possibility that the majority of our lands may fall into the hands of greedy and uprooting foreign capitalists?

It could reasonably be said that the drive to acquire more land by foreigners was stronger in the early years of the 1970's, but if it didn't continue, it is because the evolving economic-financial situation showed other, more prosperous avenues. However,

nothing has led us to believe that the danger has in any way dissipated. The circumstances may vary, but during the crisis by which our land is dominated, someone will wind up owning all the large quantities of land being offered for sale. One must not forget that the banks—the principle creditors of our farmers—are, for the most part, integrated with the foreign capitalists, or at least strongly tied to them. The smallness of our territory which is of great importance to us and to our future generations—makes it easier for us to lose it. At the prices at which the land is offered, and keeping in mind the few million hectares which are usable, the acquisition of this land is an enterprise which is more than feasible for multinational corporations. What then would happen to our country? What if circumstances determined that the Argentinian and Brazilian interest, which only a few years ago was so evident, continues despite today's adverse factors?

OUR GREAT NEIGHBORS DEFEND THEMSELVES

Both Brazil and Argentina have legislation which confronts this problem despite the vastness of their territories. In Brazil, the demands which need to be met by foreigners to buy land are very strict. In Argentina, the prohibitions refer to border fringes. If our colossal neighbors have deemed it necessary to take these measures, why have we not done so, when it is evident that it can affect—in a much more serious way—nothing less than our own sovereignty?

SOME ANTECEDENTS

This preoccupation has existed in our country, yet it has never been incorporated into legislation. In the past century, President Don Bernardo Prudencio Berro instructed his Minister of Interior as to the necessity of retaining the border territories for citizens of Uruguay. Among the most recent antecedents is the project presented in the last Constitutional Legislature under the title "Nationalization of Land," as well as an initiative of the actual process born in the conclave of San Miguel. The former was favorably received by the Commission of Senatorial Works before Parliament was closed down in 1973. The latter became a project passed by law which would have established a 50 kilometer fringe area for the border which would only be owned by legal Uruguayan citizens. Even though this project was initiated and approved at the highest level of government, it was rejected and shelved by the State Council.

In conclusion, we find ourselves unarmed and confronted by a very serious problem. In this light, we must continue discussion of the subjects.

1982 INDUCTEES TO GLOUCESTER COUNTY SPORTS HALL OF FAME HONORED

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize 11 new inductees to the Gloucester County, N.J., Sports Hall of Fame.

The elected 11 have achieved athletic excellence through professional careers, coaching, or participation in

high school, college, or semiprofessional sports. By meeting high standards, on and off the playing field, the 1982 inductees have brought honor to themselves and their communities, and have helped make sports an instrument for bringing people together.

Since recorded history, sports and athletics have provided a focus for peoples and nations to share common experiences and emotions. School sports have helped whole communities to come together and support athletic excellence. Indeed, 2 years ago, our entire Nation was captivated when the U.S. Olympic Hockey Team prevailed against overwhelming odds to become the very best in the world.

Motivation, self-discipline, and perseverance are some descriptions which apply to all athletes who work to perform their best. The 1982 inductees to the Gloucester County Sports Hall of Fame share these traits. I commend the inductees in making substantial contributions to sports, and for setting outstanding examples for our youth to follow. I am pleased that the inductees will receive well-deserved recognition and honor at the Second Annual Gloucester County Sports Hall of Fame Banquet, March 16, in Auletto's Sunset Ballroom in Deptford Township, N.J.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding the newest members of the Gloucester County Sports Hall of Fame. At this point I wish to insert the names of the 1982 inductees with a brief description of their accomplishments.

DAVE BUDD—Played 1960 to 1965 for the National Basketball Association New York Knicks. Graduated from Woodbury High School and attended Wake Forest University.

AL CUNARD—Played semi-professional baseball and managed in baseball independent leagues. Refereed high school basketball. 1928 Woodbury High School graduate, attended Drexel University. Resides in Deptford Township, N.J.

FRANK DIEDRICH—Running Back for the Penn State football team. Captain of the 1930 squad. 1928 graduate of Woodbury High School.

ROLAND ESEBJORNSEN—Coached baseball, mens and womens basketball 1927 to 1954 at Glassboro State College, N.J. 1967 Glassboro State College dedicated its gymnasium in his honor. 1918 graduate of Springfield College. Deceased.

RAY FULLER—Played semi-professional football. 1934 graduate of Pitman High School. Excelled in high school football, baseball, basketball, and track. Died while in service in Burma, July 20, 1945.

JIM HAWKINS—Coached Deptford Township High School track throughout 1970's. 1965 to 1976 established South Jersey record for wins with 112. Attended Woodbury High School and Glassboro State College where he excelled in cross-country track. Currently Vice-Principal for Deptford High School.

LORRAINE LEDDEN—Glassboro High School graduate of 1954, starred in field hockey, softball and basketball. Scored 1067 points

in high school basketball, with 29 point game average. Played shortstop on three-time champion high school softball team. Attended East Stroudsburg State College. Since 1960 has taught physical education at Clearview High School, N.J.

JIM LEONARD—Offensive Fullback for National Football League Philadelphia Eagles 1934 to 1937. Coached with the N.F.L. Pittsburgh Steelers in 1945. Graduate of St. Joseph's High School, Philadelphia, and Notre Dame University. Resident of Gloucester County since 1937.

CLIFF MAIDEN—Played catcher and first base in semi-professional baseball. Coached and managed at every level of baseball in Woodbury. 1928 graduate of Woodbury High School, excelled in high school football.

MIKE MCBATH—Played defensive line 1968 to 1972 for National Football League Buffalo Bills. Played one season in World Football League. Prior to selection in fifth round draft by the Bills, attended Penn State and Woodbury High School.

RICHARD WACKAR—Head football coach for Glassboro State College 1963 to 1980. Also coached college cross-country and is currently coaching G.S.C. golf. Began teaching at G.S.C. in 1956.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO DAVID LEVINE

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● **Mr. MAVROULES.** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues, I would like to wish David Levine a very happy birthday and a speedy recovery on the occasion of his 18th birthday.

We commend David for the excellent job he did last year as a congressional page. His intelligence, good sense, and good humor made him a pleasure to work with. We especially appreciate the professional demeanor he conveyed while he worked long and hard hours in our behalf.

We look forward to seeing him soon.

SALUTE TO VINCENT REAGOR

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● **Mr. MATSUI.** Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I salute a fine public servant, Mr. Vincent M. Reagor, on the occasion of his retirement as assistant chief deputy district attorney of Sacramento County, Calif.

For 21 years, Vincent Reagor has served with distinction in the district's attorney's office, where he was first appointed as deputy district attorney for my home county on April 24, 1961. He was promoted to supervising deputy district attorney on December

1, 1964, and has been in his current position since July 9, 1972.

Vincent Reagor was a major force behind the formulation of many important policies and procedures within the district attorney's office. He was instrumental in the formation of special prosecution units and he contributed to the introduction of word processors and computer technology to the district attorney's office. He has made countless other contributions to law enforcement in Sacramento County.

I am sure that other Members of this body will join me in expressing best wishes to Mr. Reagor as he retires. His record of service is a fine example for all of us who serve in public office.

VOTING RECORD

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● **Mr. UDALL.** Mr. Speaker, it has become my practice from time to time to list my votes in the House of Representatives here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I strongly believe that the people of southern Arizona have the right to know where I stand on the issues decided by the House, and I have found that printing my record here is the best way to provide that information.

This is not an all-inclusive list. I have omitted noncontroversial votes such as quorum calls, motions to resolve into the committee of the Whole House, and motions to approve the Journal of the previous day.

The descriptions are necessarily somewhat short, and I am sure that some of my constituents will have additional questions about the issues described here. So I invite them to write me for specifics, or to visit my district office at 300 North Main, Tucson.

The list is arranged as follows:

Key

1. Official rollcall number;
2. Number of the bill or resolution;
3. Title of the bill or resolution;
4. A description of issue being voted on;
5. The date of the action;
6. My vote, in the form Y=yes, N=no, and NV=not voting.
7. The vote of the entire Arizona delegation, in the form (Yes-No-Not voting);
8. An indication whether the motion or amendment was passed or rejected; and
9. The total vote.

272. S. 815. Defense Department Authorization, Fiscal 1982. Motion to table (kill) the Schroeder, D-CO, motion to instruct the House conferees on the bill to concur in a Senate provision requiring the Pentagon to report to Congress certain weapons cost increases. Oct. 29. N(3-1-0). Motion rejected 171-224.

273. S. 1193. State Department Authorizations. Motion to recommit to the Foreign Affairs Committee the bill to authorize

fiscal 1982 and 1983 spending by the State Department and related agencies, with instructions to amend it by transferring to the International Communication Agency \$36 million in fiscal 1982 and \$43 million in fiscal 1983 from the accounts for the administration of foreign affairs and for US participation in international organizations and conferences. Oct. 29. N(0-4-0). Motion rejected 63-318.

274. S. 1193. State Department Authorizations. Passage of the bill to authorize \$2.9 billion in fiscal 1982 and \$2.8 billion in fiscal 1983 for operations of the State Department and related agencies. Oct. 29. Y(2-2-0). Passed 317-58.

275. Foreign Construction of US Naval Vessels. Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to prohibit construction of US government naval vessels or their major components in foreign shipyards, except when the president determines, and so notifies Congress, that it is in the national security interest of the US to do so. Nov. 4. Y(3-0-1). Motion agreed to 366-21.

276. Veterans Administration and Defense Department Medical Sharing Act. Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to mandate the establishment of guidelines providing for increased coordination and sharing of medical facilities by the Veterans Administration and the Defense Department. Nov. 4. Y(3-0-1). Motion agreed to 386-0.

277. H.R. 2330. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Authorization. Amendment to delete the language allowing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to issue operating licenses to nuclear power plants before the completion of public hearings. Nov. 5. N(0-4-0). Rejected 90-304.

278. H.R. 2330. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Authorization. Amendment to prohibit the export of enriched uranium except under certain findings by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Nov. 5. N(0-4-0). Rejected 100-293.

280. H.R. 3413. Department of Energy National Security Programs Authorization. Motion to exclude the public from meetings of the conference committee on H.R. 3413, the bill making authorizations for national security programs of the Department of Energy, during consideration of classified national security information. Nov. 12. Y(4-0-0). Motion agreed to 385-0.

281. H.R. 4035. Interior Department Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Motion to recommit the conference report of the \$7.54 billion bill to the House-Senate conference committee. Nov. 12. N(3-1-0). Rejected 199-199.

283. H.J. Res. 357. Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Motion to order the previous question, thus ending debate and the possibility of amendment, on resolution providing for floor consideration of the joint resolution to provide funding authority during the period Nov. 20, 1981, through Sept. 30, 1982, for government agencies whose regular fiscal 1982 appropriations bills had not been enacted. Nov. 16. N(1-0-3). Motion agreed to 185-174.

284. H.J. Res. 357. Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Adoption of the rule providing for floor consideration, with no floor amendments allowed, of the joint resolution. Nov. 16. N(0-1-3). Adopted 197-169.

285. H.J. Res. 357. Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Motion to recommit the joint resolution to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to cut 5 percent from discretionary spending in the joint resolution, except for programs under the defense, military construction and District of

Columbia appropriations bills, and Social Security administrative expenses, veterans' medical care and food stamps. Nov. 16. N(2-1-1). Rejected 189-201.

286. H.J. Res. 357. Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Passage of the joint resolution to provide funding authority during the period Nov. 20, 1981, through Sept. 30, 1982, for government agencies whose regular fiscal 1982 appropriations bills had not been enacted. Nov. 16. Y(2-1-1). Passed 195-187.

288. H.R. 1797. Authorization of Coastwise Trading Privileges. Adoption of committee amendments which direct the transportation secretary to document the vessel Captain Tom for coastwise trade and fishing. Nov. 17. NV(3-0-1). Adopted 353-0.

292. S. 815. Defense Authorization, Fiscal 1982. Adoption of the conference report on the bill authorizing \$130,696,451,000 for Defense Department programs in fiscal 1982, including weapons procurement, research and development, operations and maintenance, and civil defense. Nov. 17. Y(4-0-0). Adopted 335-61.

293. H.R. 4482. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, which creates a new federal court of appeals primarily to handle patent cases. Nov. 18. Y(2-1-1). Motion agreed to 321-76.

294. H.R. 3454. Intelligence Authorization, Fiscal 1982. Adoption of the conference report on the bill authorizing appropriations in secret amounts for U.S. intelligence operations in fiscal 1982. Nov. 18. Y(3-0-1). Adopted 379-22.

295. H.R. 4522. District of Columbia Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to appropriate \$557,170,000 in federal funds and \$1,905,258,200 in local funds to the District of Columbia for fiscal 1982. Nov. 18. Y(1-2-1). Adopted 228-174.

296. H.R. 4522. District of Columbia Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Motion to (1) recede from disagreement with the Senate, and (2) to concur with the Senate position on provisions relating to the salary of the city administrator of the District of Columbia. Nov. 18. N(0-3-1). Motion to recede rejected 186-210.

297. H.R. 4995. Defense Department Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Adoption of H. Res. 275, waiving certain points of order against the bill to appropriate \$196,681,709,000 for Defense Department programs in fiscal 1982. Nov. 18. Y(3-0-1). Adopted 298-4.

298. H.R. 4995. Defense Department Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Substitute for the amendment in vote 299 below to delete \$1.799 billion for Air Force procurement intended for the B-1 bomber. Nov. 18. Y(1-2-1). Rejected 99-307. (Although not stated in amendment, Murtha intended to shift funding to the FB-111 bomber.)

299. H.R. 4995. Defense Department appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Amendment to delete \$1,801 billion from Air Force procurement intended for B-1 bomber. Nov. 18. Y(1-2-1). Rejected 142-263.

300. H.R. 4995. Defense Department Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Amendment to delete \$1,913,200,000 in Air Force research, development, test and evaluation funds for the MX missile and basing system. Nov. 18. N(0-3-1). Rejected 139-264.

301. H.R. 4995. Defense Department Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Amendment to the Schroeder, D-CO, amendment to cut 2 percent from the funds appropriated in the bill for weapons procurement and for research,

development, test and evaluation. Exempted from the cut were funds for procurement of spare parts. Nov. 18. N(0-3-1). Rejected 140-256.

302. H.R. 4995. Defense Department Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Substitute for the Schroeder, D-CO, amendment to cut 2 percent from the funds appropriated in the bill for weapons procurement and for research, development, test and evaluation. Exempted from the cut were funds for procurement of spare parts, repair parts, and ammunition. Nov. 18. N(0-3-1). Rejected 197-202.

303. H.R. 4995. Defense Department Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Passage of the bill to appropriate \$197,443,289,000 for Department of Defense programs in fiscal 1982. Nov. 18. Y(3-0-1). Passed 335-61.

304. H. Con. Res. 224. Strategic Arms Talks. Adoption of the concurrent resolution expressing congressional support for President Reagan's Nov. 18, 1981, proposals for limiting strategic and intermediate range weapons. Nov. 19. Y(3-0-1). Adopted 382-3.

305. H.R. 3413. Department of Energy National Security Programs Authorization fiscal 1982. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to authorize \$5,120,200,000 for national security programs of the Department of Energy in fiscal year 1982. Nov. 19. Y(3-0-1). Adopted 335-55.

306. H.R. 3663. Bus Regulatory Reform. Adoption of the rule providing for House floor consideration of the bill to reduce regulation of the intercity bus industry. Nov. 19. Y(2-1-1). Adopted 306-80.

307. H.R. 3663. Bus Regulatory Reform. Motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of the bill to reduce regulation of the intercity bus industry. Nov. 19. Y(3-0-1). Motion agreed to 335-33.

308. H.R. 3663. Bus Regulatory Reform. Passage of the bill to reduce government regulation of the intercity bus industry. Nov. 19. Y(3-0-1). Passed 305-83.

309. H.J. Res. 349. Sinai Peace-keeping Force. Passage of the joint resolution authorizing US participation in the multinational peace-keeping force in the Sinai Peninsula following Israeli withdrawal in April, 1982, and authorizing \$125 million in fiscal 1982 as the US contribution to the budget of the peace-keeping force. Nov. 19. Y(2-0-2). Passed 368-13.

311. H.R. 4144. Energy and Water Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Motion that the House recede from its position and agree to a Senate amendment to allow construction to continue on the Garrison Diversion water project in North Dakota. Nov. 20. NV(2-0-2). Motion rejected 67-314.

312. H.R. 3046. Older Americans Act. Passage of the bill to extend Older Americans programs through fiscal 1984 and to grant increased administrative flexibility to state and local providers of services to the elderly. Nov. 20. Y(3-0-1). Passed 379-4.

313. H. Con. Res. 220. Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commemoration. Adoption of the concurrent resolution to establish a commission to arrange for the convening of a joint session of Congress on Jan. 27, 1982, to commemorate the 100th birthday of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Nov. 20. Y(3-0-1). Adopted 344-18.

315. H.J. Res. 357. Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Motion to recommit the conference report on the joint resolution to the conference committee. Nov. 22. N(3-1-0). Rejected 184-215.

316. H.J. Res. 357. Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Adoption of the confer-

ence report on the joint resolution to provide funding authority during the period Nov. 20, 1981, through July 15, 1982, for government agencies whose regular fiscal 1982 appropriations bills had not been enacted. Nov. 22. Y(1-3-0). Adopted 205-194.

317. H.J. Res. 357. Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Motion that the House recede from its disagreement to a Senate amendment providing additional pay and benefits for air traffic controllers. Nov. 22. N(3-1-0). Motion agreed to 213-183.

318. H.J. Res. 368. Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Motion to commit the joint resolution to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to advance the expiration date to Dec. 13, 1981, from Feb. 3, 1982, and to add funding for Public Health Service hospitals and clinics. Nov. 23. N(3-1-0). Motion agreed to 221-176.

319. H.J. Res. 368. Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Passage of the joint resolution to provide funding authority during the period Nov. 20, 1981, through Dec. 15, 1981, for government agencies whose regular fiscal 1982 appropriations bills had not been enacted. Y(4-0-0). Passed 367-26.

320. H.J. Res. 341. Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System Waivers. Motion to postpone until December 10th, consideration of the joint resolution approving President Reagan's waivers to the 1977 decision to build the pipeline. The waivers were aimed at securing private financing by putting more financial risk on gas consumers. Dec. 9. N(0-4-0). Motion rejected 50-270.

322. H.J. Res. 341. Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System Waivers. Passage of the joint resolution approving the president's waivers of various stipulations in the 1977 decision to build a pipeline to carry natural gas from Alaska to the continental United States. The waivers were aimed at securing private financing for the pipeline. Dec. 9. Y(4-0-0). Passed 233-173.

323. H.R. 3566. Foreign Aid Authorization, Fiscal 1982. Adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 291) providing for consideration of the bill to authorize appropriations for military, economic and development aid abroad, and to establish the Peace Corps as an independent agency. Dec. 9. Y(3-1-0). Adopted 250-151.

324. H.R. 3566. Foreign Aid Authorization, Fiscal 1982. Amendment to prohibit aid to Indonesia. Dec. 9. N(0-4-0). Rejected 55-355.

325. H.R. 3566. Foreign Aid Authorization, Fiscal 1982. Amendment to delete provisions in the bill removing the Peace Corps from the ACTION agency. Dec. 9. N(1-3-0). Rejected 155-258.

326. H.R. 3566. Foreign Aid Authorization, Fiscal 1982. Amendment stating that Congress condemns the government of Libya for its support of international terrorism, its obstruction of peace in the Middle East and its efforts to destabilize the governments of its neighbors in Africa; and that Congress believes the president should review and report within 180 days of the enactment of H.R. 3566 on what concrete steps the United States could take, including a ban on importation of Libyan oil, to put economic and political pressure on Libya to force it to abandon its policies. Dec. 9. Y(4-0-0). Adopted 356-46.

327. H.R. 3566. Foreign Aid Authorization, Fiscal 1982. Passage of the bill to authorize \$5,727,854,000 for fiscal 1982 and \$6,415,930,000 for fiscal 1983 (but no more in fiscal 1983 than requested by the president) for military, economic and development aid abroad, and to establish the Peace

Corps as an independent agency. Dec. 9, Y(2-2-0), Passed 222-184.

329. S.J. Res. 115. Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System Waivers. Passage of the joint resolution approving the president's waivers of various stipulations in the 1977 decision to build a pipeline to carry natural gas from Alaska to the continental United States. The waivers were aimed at securing private financing for the pipeline. Dec. 10. Y(4-0-0), Passed 230-188.

330. H.J. Res. 370. Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Motion to recommit the joint resolution to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to report it back immediately with a substitute amendment making a 4 percent cut in spending contained in seven domestic spending programs, with exemptions for entitlements, law enforcement and certain other programs. Dec. 10. Y(3-1-0), Adopted 222-194.

331. H.J. Res. 370. Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Passage of the joint resolution providing funding authority during the period Dec. 15, 1981, through March 31, 1982, for government agencies whose regular fiscal 1982 appropriations bills had not been enacted. Dec. 10. Y(3-1-0), Passed 218-197.

332. H. Con. Res. 230. Second Budget Resolution, Fiscal 1982. Adoption of the rule (H Res 295) providing for House floor consideration of the second concurrent budget resolution for fiscal 1982. Dec. 10. Y(4-0-0), Adopted 248-154.

333. S. Con. Res. 50. Second Budget Resolution, Fiscal 1982. Adoption of the concurrent resolution to affirm the first fiscal 1982 budget resolution and to express the sense of the Senate that: (1) the Budget Committee by March 31, 1982, report a budget resolution containing a balanced budget for fiscal 1984; (2) a balanced budget should be achieved through spending reductions in all parts of the budget, including entitlement programs, and revenue increases, excluding changes in the Accelerated Cost Recovery System and individual rate reductions provided by the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 (P.L. 97-34); and (3) under the committee plan, federal outlays should not exceed 20.5 percent of the gross national product in fiscal 1984. Dec. 10. Y(3-1-0). Adopted 206-200.

335. H.R. 4559. Foreign Aid Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the bill making appropriations for foreign aid and related programs in fiscal 1982. Dec. 11. Y(4-0-0). Motion agreed to 363-16.

336. H.R. 4559. Foreign Aid Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Amendment to reduce the contribution to the sixth replenishment of the International Development Association from \$850 million to \$725 million. The Edwards amendment would have reduced the contribution to \$520 million. Dec. 11. Y(2-2-0). Adopted 281-114.

337. H.R. 4559. Foreign Aid Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Amendment to reduce the contribution to the sixth replenishment of the International Development Association from \$850 million to \$725 million. Dec. 11. Y(4-0-0). Adopted 372-1.

338. H.R. 4559. Foreign Aid Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Passage of the bill to appropriate \$7,440,280,064 for foreign aid and related programs in fiscal 1982. Dec. 11. Y(2-2-0). Passed 199-166.

339. H.R. 4995. Defense Department Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Motion to close to the public conference committee meeting on H.R. 4995 when information relating to the

national security was under discussion. Dec. 14. Y(4-0-0). Motion agreed to 359-1.

340. H.R. 4910. District of Columbia Bond Authority. Passage of the bill to allow the District of Columbia to issue general obligation bonds and notes and revenue bonds and other obligations. Dec. 14. Y(4-0-0). Passed 375-6.

341. H.R. 2559. Coast Guard Authorization, Fiscal 1982. Amendment to bar the use of funds for specified Coast Guard facilities. Dec. 14. N(0-4-0). Rejected 0-389.

342. H.R. 2559. Coast Guard Authorization, Fiscal 1982. Passage of the bill to authorize \$1.9 billion in fiscal 1982 for Coast Guard activities. Y(4-0-0). Passed 391-2. Dec. 14.

343. H.R. 4700. Standby Petroleum Emergency Authority Act. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 288) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to provide the president with standby authority to allocate supplies and control prices of oil during a severe petroleum supply interruption. Dec. 14. Y(1-3-0). Adopted 272-113.

344. H.R. 4700. Standby Petroleum Emergency Authority Act. Passage of the bill to give the president standby authority to control oil supplies and prices in the event of a severe petroleum supply interruption. Dec. 19 NV (0-3-1). Passed 255-136. Dec. 14.

345. H.R. 4995. Defense Department Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to appropriate \$199,899,264,000 for the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1982. Y(4-0-0). Passed 334-84. Dec. 15.

347. H.R. 4331. Minimum Social Security Benefits. Motion to suspend the rules and adopt the conference report on the bill to restore the minimum Social Security benefit; to extend the payroll tax to the first six months of sick pay; and to permit the borrowing of assets among the three Social Security trust funds through Dec. 31, 1982. Dec. 16. Y(4-0-0). Motion agreed to 412-10.

348. H.R. 4559. Foreign Aid Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to appropriate \$7,495,221,970 for foreign assistance and related programs in fiscal 1982. Dec. 16. Y(2-2-0). Adopted 217-201.●

THE HOBBS ACT

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● **Mr. HUBBARD.** Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jimmy F. Tutor of Ledbetter, Ky., has written me a well-worded letter in regard to proposed amendments to the Hobbs Act. Mr. Tutor's letter is one which I want to share with my colleagues and I wish to do so at this time:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HUBBARD: Please vote against bill S. 613, sponsored by Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina. This bill would amend the Hobbs Act.

Under present laws, a fist fight on the picket line is treated like a fist fight anywhere else, punishable by state and local penalties. A fist fight on the picket line is no more wrong—and no more right—than a fist fight at a football game.

It is no more wrong—and no more right—if it is started by an employer, a scab, or a union member.

The Hobbs Act amendment would change all that, making the union member—and the union member alone—liable to Federal punishment as an "extortionist."

Picketing is a form of free speech, protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America. This fundamental freedom must not be endangered by legislation that would threaten anyone, and certainly not union members alone, with unbearably long prison terms and irrationally large fines in the event of a flare-up.

Please stand by us. We need you.

Yours truly,

JIMMY F. TUTOR.●

COOL WATER COAL GASIFICATION PROGRAM

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● **Mr. MINETA.** Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are concerned about our ability to adequately meet our energy needs and about improving our international trade position, it is a significant step to have a major Japanese and American partnership to develop alternative methods of electric generation. Such an undertaking has indeed just begun, and it will lead to construction of a 100-megawatt cool water gasification plant in southern California. Much of the \$300 million in costs for the project will be shared by a consortium of Japanese firms—the Japan Cool Water Program Partnership, and various American energy corporations. The agreement to form this joint venture was signed on February 24, 1982, and I want to share with my colleagues a Washington Post article about the event, which discusses in more detail this unique project.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 25, 1982]

EXPERIMENTAL POWERPLANT SET FOR MOJAVE DESERT

(By Martha M. Hamilton)

A group of Japanese firms, including Tokyo Electric Power Co., yesterday joined a group of American companies and the Electric Power Research Institute in financing a \$300 million experimental power plant fueled by coal that will be transformed into gas.

The Cool Water Coal Gasification program will build a 100-megawatt power plant in the Mojave desert in Southern California that will be part of the Southern California Edison Company system.

The process involves changing 1,000 tons of coal a day into fuel gas, using water and oxygen to do so; the gas is then cleaned and fed into steam and gas turbines that generate electricity.

The plant is scheduled to begin operations in mid-1984. At the end of the 6½ year pilot program, the California utility has the option to buy the plant and operate in commercially.

Funding for the alternate fuel program has come so far from the research institutes and private firms, but a proposal is pending

before the federal Synfuel Corporation to provide some financial relief to the firms involved in the experiment if it is less successful than anticipated.

The government has been asked to provide up to \$63 million to make up losses but would pay nothing if the experiment operates as projected, said Lawrence Papay, vice president of advanced engineering for the utility company and chairman of Cool Water Board of Control.

The plan is not a commercial project but a large experiment that the participants say will bring the industry closer to the point where commercial operations are feasible. Participants in the financing will get their money back without interest. "It's not a for-profit venture," said Papay.

The Japan Cool Water Program Partnership (named after another generating station) has pledged \$30 million to finance the project. The Japanese group includes Tokyo Electric Power Co., which is the world's largest privately-owned utility; the Central Research Institute of the Electric Power Industry; Toshiba CGP Corp. and IHI Coal Gasification Project Corp.

The Electric Power Research Institute, the nonprofit research and development agency of the electric utility industry, is providing \$105 million of the funding. Texaco Inc. is providing \$45 million, and Bechtel Power Corp., which is building the plant, and General Electric Co. are each providing \$30 million. The remainder comes from Southern California Edison and the Empire State Electric Energy Research Corp., which is made up of seven New York state utilities.

Even with conservation and the development of alternate energy sources, Japan still depends on oil for 66 percent of its energy needs, said Kazuo Fujimori, chairman of the Japanese group.

Although the coal gasification process has been licensed for use in 96 plants in 21 countries, the Cool Water project is the first time that the gas will be used to generate electricity for consumer use, said James L. Dunlap, vice president for alternate energy for Texaco.●

DWI ON THE HIGHWAYS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, America must do something about driving while intoxicated. Half of the people that are killed from automobile accidents are a result of driving while intoxicated. I just passed through San Angelo and read a story in the San Angelo newspaper.

Here are some of the key lines:

A car going the wrong direction on the Winters Freeway late Friday broadsided another car, killing a 26-year-old Abilene man. . . . about a mile south of South 14th Street, apparently swerved toward the median to avoid a head-on collision when he saw a car coming at him in his lane, Price said.

But Price said the car broadsided Clark's vehicle on the passenger's side. Price arrived at the accident scene moments after the collision and said Bouldin was dead at the scene.

Price arrested a 25-year-old unemployed Abilene man for driving while intoxicated immediately after the accident, said Sgt. Jerry Franklin. He was driving in the wrong direction and charges of involuntary manslaughter are expected to be filed against him, Franklin said.

Clark and Bouldin were returning from a basketball game in Sweetwater where they were referees when the accident happened about 10 p.m., Price said.

DWI is a crime. It is a serious crime. For this man to drive headon into another automobile when he is going down the wrong side of a freeway is just like someone walking down the street shooting a rifle in every direction.●

FORD, UAW AGREEMENT—A RAY OF HOPE FOR U.S. AUTO INDUSTRY

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, every American concerned about renewing the vigor of the U.S. economy and restoring the health of the domestic auto industry should applaud the historic agreement between the Ford Motor Co., and the United Auto Workers Union.

UAW President Douglas Frazer and Philip Caldwell, chairman of the board of Ford, demonstrated uncommon wisdom and a statesmanlike willingness to make sacrifices for the future benefit and, yes, even the survival of the U.S. auto industry.

That same unselfish wisdom was shown by thousands of Ford workers who ratified the agreement.

I would hope the example they set will open the way for renewed talks between the UAW and General Motors Corp.

Few congressional districts are as dependent upon the success of these negotiations as mine which includes the city of Pontiac where auto industry-related unemployment is now well above 25 percent.

Ratification of similar agreements throughout the domestic industry would create a new basis for American competition in the world market and guarantee more jobs for American auto workers.

American cars can compete with the Japanese and Germans and others in terms of quality, craftsmanship, and durability. But they must also be able to compete in terms of price. This agreement will go a long way toward closing that price gap.

While those of us in Michigan are first to feel the effects of the depression in the U.S. auto industry, its health and survival are critical to the entire Nation.

It is our basic industry, vital to employment and to our national security.

More than 14 million Americans depend upon it for their livelihood—roughly one out of every six jobs in this country.

Steel, rubber, glass, plastics all derive a significant portion of their business from supplying the needs of a healthy American auto industry.

The recent accomplishments of Ford and the UAW are vital self-help measures necessary to recovery of American leadership in the industry. But there are other things needed that only Congress and the administration can do.

We still have not squarely addressed the problem of unfair competition from Japan. While I commend the efforts of Bill Brock, our Special Trade Representative, in winning some concessions from the Japanese, it is clear by looking at trade figures that we are still operating at a significant disadvantage.

The simple truth is that Japan sells about 2 million cars in the U.S. market, but virtually no U.S. cars are sold in Japan.

Europe has not been as slow as the United States to close the trade doors to Japan's one-sided marketing policies. We should be prepared to do the same unless the Japanese show willingness to practice some self-restraint.

To be successful, trade has to be a two-way street, and for too many years, it has been all one-way with Japan.

Just as the Japanese Government aggressively promotes and supports the Japanese car manufacturers, we should begin taking steps to shore up the American position in the marketplace.

The initiatives the administration is taking to ease the regulatory burden that has shackled progress in the industry and added countless dollars to the consumer pricetag are positive and helpful.

But Congress can help, too, by passing legislation such as I have proposed, to provide a \$1,500 tax credit for the purchase of a new, American-made car.

American automakers are currently spending billions to improve designs and plant efficiency. Auto workers are showing a willingness to make personal sacrifices to allow the industry to compete at home and in the world market. It is time for Congress to demonstrate that it, too, has a stake in the survival of the U.S. auto industry by doing what it can to make that competition as fair and as free as possible.●

A TRIBUTE TO MR. GORDON F. LEVY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

• Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, we want to bring to the attention of our colleagues the outstanding contributions made to our community by Gordon F. Levy. Gordon will be honored by the San Jose Hospital Foundation at their annual Legacy Medical Ball on Saturday evening, March 27. This award is presented each year to an individual who has made significant contributions throughout his professional and public life to benefit our community.

A native of Fresno, Gordon came to Santa Clara County in 1951 after graduation from Stanford University. He spent 23 years with the Dean Witter Co., and upon leaving the brokerage firm he became executive director of administration at the San Jose Chamber of Commerce, and later accepted the responsibility of managing the new convention and visitors bureau.

Gordon has been honored in the past for his many contributions to the life of our valley. He received the Jaycees Young Man of the Year Award and San Jose's Distinguished Citizens Award. He is past president of the Metro YMCA, Junior Achievement of Santa Clara County, and San Jose Rotary. He has been an active, participating member of the San Jose Hospital board, the Institute for Medical Research, and the American Red Cross. He has given of his time and varied talents to the San Jose Hospital Foundation, United Way of Santa Clara County, and the Estate Planners Council. His religious, fraternal, and social life revolve around his membership in Temple-Emanuel, the Scottish Rite, the Islam Temple of the Shrine, and the University Club of San Jose and the San Jose Athletic Club.

Gordon truly deserves the honor that will be accorded him on March 27. He has been an outstanding member of our community. He has affected many lives. The term "Good Citizen" certainly fits Gordon F. Levy.●

LINCOLN AND WASHINGTON,
OVERLOOKED AGAIN

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

• Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday a very thoughtful article by Bruce Chapman, Director of the Census Bureau, appeared in the Washington

Post. Mr. Chapman observed that in recent years our national holidays have come and gone with almost no attention paid to the people, events, and ideas they are supposed to commemorate. We are ignoring important parts of our heritage and thereby sapping our Nation's spirit. I believe my colleagues will find these reflections well worth reading, and I submit the article to be reprinted in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 20, 1982]

LINCOLN AND WASHINGTON, OVERLOOKED
AGAIN

(By Bruce Chapman)

Once again, Lincoln and Washington missed their official birthday parties.

The national holidays were established to help remind each generation of the faith, pain and glory of our past, and of our future as a united people. What, then, does it tell us about the health of our political culture when national holidays pass with scarcely any official or private observance?

Some schools still commemorate the national patriotic occasions. A few still hang a picture of Washington in their classrooms; but most do not.

Newspapers still fuss a bit over national holidays, at least on the editorial pages. But society's most popular medium of communication and its strongest cultural influence is television, and television—including the "public" network—generally ignores national days.

Do you doubt it? If you go to your television guide, you will find no tale of Lincoln's battle to save the Union and free the slaves, no personal tribute to his honesty, humor and compassion; nor any program on a relevant present-day issue—say, the state of race relations, regionalism, political integrity.

The same avoidance is true for Washington. Television makes no inquiries into the present-day fight for liberties as seen against the backdrop of the generation of the Founders, no thoughtful exposition on the changing Presidency and certainly no retelling of the Revolution or the early years of the Republic. "The Father of Our Country" now apparently is retired to history's nursing home and forgotten by his "family."

A review of the TV schedules for Lincoln's and Washington's birthdays in 1978, 1979, 1980 and 1981 shows neglect similar to this year's. On Feb. 15, 1981, three days after Lincoln's birthday, PBS did air a Hall of Fame program on Lincoln. But out of 112 movies and special programs presented by the TV networks on or around the February holidays for the past four years, only that one could be construed as relevant to either President.

The same score, more or less, can be added up for Thanksgiving (does anyone remember the Pilgrims?) and Independence Day (noteworthy on television for a couple of programs of American music in 1981, for example, and that was it.) Veterans' Day tends to be ignored, although ABC's "Real People" paid the Vets a genuine tribute in 1981. We have no "memory" for Memorial Day anymore, either. It and Labor Day are notable on television almost solely as the first and last long weekends in summer. More attention is paid to Halloween.

Why have our national days atrophied in the popular culture? Perhaps it can be laid in part to anti-establishment biases of the people who run television networks, includ-

ing the public network. Ben Stein, in "The View From Sunset Boulevard," provides a good insight into that Hollywood mentality that both scorns and fears the square values of the American heartland. For Hollywood and the television elite, Honest Abe is déclassé.

Part of the indifference to national days also may be laid to the pluralist ethos of the past two decades, vaunting the pride of every distinctive race and nationality and every "life style" allegiance, prizing especially those qualities that separate us. This trend began in an admirable spirit of mutual acceptance and discovery. But by overemphasizing our differences, we stand in danger of forgetting our common roots and our common goals. The motto "E Pluribus Unum"—"Out of Many, One"—seems lately to have been reversed to read, "Out of One, Many." If so, who are the "we" in "We, the People"?

The revisionist historians can be given some of the responsibility, too. If our forebears were unable to see the wart on Lincoln's cheek, some of our contemporary historians can see nothing else.

Professor C. Vann Woodward reviewed the results of the revisionists' works recently in The New Republic, finding that their cynical trick is simply to turn all the old myths of American goodness upside down. "Thus," he writes, "'discovery' of the New World becomes 'invasion' thereof, settlement becomes 'conquest,' and Europeans the 'savages' . . . The advancement of the western frontier is sometimes pictured as a species of genocide, a wave of holocausts."

Those who see the American past as wicked do not compare our record with those of other lands, nor do they credit the reforming spirit that repeatedly overcame the failings of past ages.

Nor to those who rail against American heroes—or, worse, ignore them—have any good effect on the spirit of our time. What we tell ourselves about ourselves is crucial to the morale of the population as we face up to the adversities and challenges presented to our generation, as they were to all previous generations.

This country has a true and inspiring story to tell of itself; not a jingoist or hateful story, but just the opposite. Why isn't it being told on our national holidays?●

AMERICANS ARE PAYING FOR
JAPAN'S DEFENSE.

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

• Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration has promised to spend more—much more—on defense. This was followed by the announcement from Tokyo that the Japanese Government will only increase its defense spending by an infinitesimal amount.

Put succinctly, Americans are paying for Japan's defense.

The Japanese decision is quite rational. Why should it spend more on defense when it can count on Washington to shoulder the burden alone? Right now Japan, with the second

largest economy in the world, spends 0.9 percent of its gross national product on defense. The United States already spends 5.9 percent and President Reagan wants to increase that by 25 percent over just 5 years.

The money Japan and other allies do not spend on defense is being used to outdo us in the free market that we are spending huge sums to defend. We are paying to preserve the freedom of others, which is fine, while others are investing their money to improve Toyotas and Sonys and undercut our products, which is not so fine.

American defense policies have had to be intertwined with those of our allies. But we ought not to bear the burden alone.●

SMOKING: A PUBLIC HEALTH TRAGEDY

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Surgeon General recently issued a report, "The Health Consequences of Smoking," which confirms the fact that smoking is properly public health enemy No. 1. It establishes in excruciating detail the relationship between smoking and cancer and sets forth a sound rationale for the Congress to begin action on establishing a serious program of smoking prevention.

The Surgeon General concludes:

Eighty-five percent of lung cancer deaths are due to smoking;

The lung cancer death rate for women is rising faster than that for men and will shortly surpass the rate from breast cancer; and

Cigarette smoking is the major cause of laryngeal, oral and esophageal cancer. It is a contributory factor in the development of bladder, kidney and pancreatic cancer.

In addition, the report points out that while available evidence is not adequate at this time to conclude that passive smoking causes lung cancer in nonsmokers, Assistant Secretary for Health, Edward N. Brandt, writes:

For the purpose of preventive medicine, prudence dictates that nonsmokers avoid exposure to second-hand tobacco smoke to the extent possible.

The report also contains good news for those smokers who want to quit. It notes that

Quitting smoking reduces one's cancer risk substantially... even after many years of smoking.

I want to commend this report to the attention of each Member and ask that the editorial "Help For Smokers," from the Washington Post Friday, February 26, 1982, be printed in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Friday, Feb. 26, 1982]

HELP FOR SMOKERS

The just-released Surgeon General's report on smoking should be required reading for smokers. Previously known associations between smoking and cancer are now clearer; a few new ones turn up, and there is stronger evidence that nonsmokers sharing the same air with smokers may share the ill effects.

Smoking was officially recognized to be the country's chief preventable cause of death three years ago. That it is a causal factor in cancer of the lung, larynx, mouth and esophagus was also a finding of the 1979 Report of the Surgeon General. Based on additional evidence, the new report concludes that smoking is not just a cause but a major cause—in the case of lung and larynx cancer, the major cause—of these diseases. Similarly, the known connection between smoking and bladder, kidney and pancreatic cancers is upgraded from a "significant association" to a "contributory factor." For the first time in this series, the report cites evidence of an association between smoking and cancers of the stomach and cervix.

All in all, smoking accounts for 30 percent of cancer deaths. But though the Surgeon General's report deals only with this one risk, cancer is not the chief cause of death from smoking. That distinction belongs to coronary heart disease, which is also the chief cause of all deaths in this country (cancer is No. 2). Smokers also suffer higher rates of dozens of chronic and acute diseases ranging from emphysema and peptic ulcer to influenza. Smoking is the chief avoidable risk during pregnancy, and it vastly increases the risk of most occupational exposures. In short, it is such a pervasive health risk that no epidemiological study would be conducted today without detailed questions on smoking history.

Still, more than 50 million Americans smoke. Most of them know there are risks, though few understand how great they are. Maybe a few, though we hope not very many, believe the Tobacco Institute when it asserts, as it did this week, that "the question is still open" on whether smoking causes cancer.

The real reason there are still so many smokers is that it is so hard to stop for good. Scientists disagree on whether smoking is an addiction comparable to heroin or alcohol addiction, but it is clear that it is more than just a habit. Studies now under way may turn up better methods of helping people to quit permanently. Until then, the best therapy is a healthy dose of good, old-fashioned fear.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of last session, I introduced H.R. 4957, the "Comprehensive Smoking Prevention Education Act of 1981." The bill proposes to expand public knowledge about the health effects of smoking by establishing a statutory presence for the activities of the Department of Health and Human Services' Office on Smoking and Health and changing the health warning label currently displayed on cigarette advertising and packages.

Since the legislation's introduction, 43 of our colleagues have joined me as cosponsors. In addition, the bill has been endorsed by a wide range of health and scientific organizations including:

American Cancer Society;
American Academy of Pediatrics;
American Medical Student Association;
American Association for Respiratory Therapy;
American Heart Association;
Citizens for the Treatment of High Blood Pressure, Inc.;
Coalition for Health and the Environment;
American Lung Association;
Action on Smoking and Health;
American Dental Association;
American Council on Science and Health;
Maryland State Dental Association;
American Public Health Association;
American College of Cardiology;
American Nurses' Association, Inc.;
and
Association of State and Territorial Health Officials.

I am pleased to announce today the introduction of a revised version of this legislation, the "Comprehensive Smoking Prevention Education Act of 1982," reflecting two suggested improvements I have received since the bill was submitted for public comment. The new bill, H.R. 5653, is similar to H.R. 4957 with the exception of technical amendments and two additions to the labeling sections concerning the inclusion of a health warning label on addiction and the requirement that manufacturers disclose chemical ingredients added to cigarettes.

In view of the growing reliance of cigarette manufacturers on flavor additives of unknown nature and toxicity, it is appropriate that smokers and health professionals be aware of the chemical ingredients that are added to cigarettes. H.R. 5653 would require that these ingredients be disclosed on the cigarette package. In addition to making smokers better informed, ingredient labels will make it possible for scientists to begin to assess the human health effects of these substances.

The second provision calls for the placement of a warning label in the legislation's proposed rotational system calling attention to the fact that cigarettes are addictive. Any smoker who has ever tried to quit knows the powerful, habituating quality of cigarettes. Smoking is an easy habit to start but one that can be nearly impossible to stop. In terms of social, health and human costs, cigarettes can be characterized as among the most dangerous legal drugs in use today.

Mr. Speaker, as the breadth of support for H.R. 4957 indicates, there is now a strong commitment on the part of the voluntary health sector to make smoking prevention a major priority of the 1980's. By making changes in the current health warning label, by giving visibility to smoking prevention

activities at the Federal level and by working closer than ever before with the voluntary sector, the number of Americans who smoke can be reduced.

Public hearings on H.R. 4957 and H.R. 5653 will begin on Friday, March 5, 1982, before the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment. The hearings will begin at 9:45 a.m. in room 2123 of the Rayburn House Office Building. A second day of public testimony will be heard on Friday, March 12, 1982.

I urge each Member's support for this important legislation.●

THE PLO AND EL SALVADOR

HON. CHARLES F. DOUGHERTY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I have been contacted by many of my constituents about President Reagan's support of the current government in El Salvador. This controversial issue has been among the most complicated matters to face the 97th Congress, and any course of action by the President is sure to meet the opposition of some portion of the American public. Nevertheless, many of us can agree that the election scheduled this month in El Salvador is an important step toward solving their nation's conflict.

To better evaluate the El Salvador issue, I feel that any relevant facts should be brought to the attention of the general public. The following article appeared in the Wall Street Journal last month, and it explains how the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) has provided assistance to the guerrillas fighting in El Salvador. I found the article very interesting, and I hope that my colleagues examine it carefully as the House of Representatives considers legislation on aid to this Central American country.

[The Wall Street Journal, Jan. 14, 1982]

ARAFAT SAYS PLO AIDS FOREIGN GUERRILLA UNITS—PILOTS SAID TO BE SERVING IN NICARAGUA, AND TROOPS IN EL SALVADOR, ANGOLA

Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat, in a speech in Beirut last weekend, said that guerrillas from the Palestine Liberation Organization are serving in Nicaragua, El Salvador and Angola.

In New York, the Nicaraguan delegation to the United Nations categorically denied the statement. In Washington, a spokesman for a joint commission of El Salvador rebel organizations said he didn't have enough information to comment. Angolan spokesmen couldn't be reached.

Mr. Arafat's comments appear to confirm some elements of a U.S. State Department paper that claimed that the guerrilla movement in El Salvador was supported by Soviet allies, such as the PLO. The paper was criticized after its release for allegedly sloppy documentation.

Mr. Arafat mentioned the PLO presence in the three countries during an address to the General Federation of Palestinian Writers and Journalists, which was meeting in Beirut to celebrate the 17th anniversary of Mr. Arafat's guerrilla movement, Al Fatah.

Mr. Arafat, in a passage of his speech emphasizing the links between the Palestinian revolution and other "national liberation" groups around the world said that PLO pilots were serving in Nicaragua, and that other PLO guerrillas were in El Salvador and the African nation of Angola.

"The Palestinian identity is one of revolutionary struggle and universal in its character not a racist movement," Mr. Arafat said in citing the involvement in the three countries.

The PLO leader didn't explain what the pilots and guerrillas were doing, and other PLO officials in Beirut refused to elaborate on his comments. But Palestinian sources in Beirut said that relations between the PLO and the revolutionary movements in Latin America are more than a decade old, and include various forms of military support.

PALESTINIAN LINK

Palestinian sources said that PLO relations with the rebels in El Salvador are "relatively deep rooted" because the leader of the Communist Party there, Shafik Handal, is of Palestinian origin. His father is said to have emigrated to El Salvador in 1921 from Bethlehem in the West Bank area currently occupied by Israel. Mr. Handal's Salvadoran Communist Party is one of five organizations forming the Farabundo Marti rebel coalition that has been battling government forces there.

Sources in Beirut said that Mr. Handal visited Lebanon last March at the invitation of the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, an avowedly pro-Soviet group under the PLO umbrella. Mr. Handal was also welcomed by other PLO groups, including Mr. Arafat's Fatah.

While in Beirut last March, Mr. Handal said that about 2,000 residents of El Salvador were of Palestinian origin. "I wouldn't be revealing a secret if I say that there are some in our revolutionary cadres who are Arabs," Mr. Handal is said to have told one PLO gathering. He may have been referring to second and third-generation immigrants living in El Salvador, such as himself. The Salvadoran rebel also charged during his visit to Beirut that Israel had been sending military technicians to assist the army of El Salvador.

These Beirut disclosures paralleled some of the information in the State Department paper. That document alleged that Mr. Arafat met the Salvadoran guerrilla leaders in Managua, Nicaragua, on July 22, 1980, and promised them "military equipment, including arms and aircraft."

The U.S. paper also asserted that a Salvadoran guerrilla leader had met with PLO officials in Beirut in August and November 1980, and that "the PLO has trained selected Salvadorans in the Near East and in Nicaragua."

In Washington, the State Department hadn't any comment on PLO activity in Nicaragua, El Salvador and Angola, saying it had only seen news reports and was awaiting more information.

Mr. Arafat's reference to the presence of PLO pilots in Nicaragua was denied by a Nicaraguan diplomat in New York.

Alejandro Bendana, deputy ambassador for Nicaragua to the United Nations, said, "There aren't any Palestinian pilots in Nicaragua. We don't have any guerrillas in Nica-

ragua any more except for the Samozistas (opponents of the current government). The only people in the regular army and the regular air force are Nicaraguans, and we don't have much of an air force to speak of." He said that Nicaragua is one of nearly 100 countries that recognize the PLO and that the PLO has an office in Managua with which his country has "the best of relations."

A PLO delegation visited Nicaragua and arranged a \$12 million loan to the regime, according to the sources. "Since then, we have exchanged several visits," said one Palestinian source.

The sources didn't provide any elaboration of Mr. Arafat's comment about PLO assistance to Angola, which has also received help from Cuban forces in its civil war against pro-Western guerrillas.●

SOCIAL SECURITY DEATH FRAUD

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, in September of last year it was revealed that as much as \$100 million in social security benefits were paid to some 8,000 dead people. Relatives or friends of the deceased beneficiaries had not reported the deaths and had collected the checks themselves.

The Social Security Administration discovered this fraud when it cross-checked the records of deceased medicare recipients with social security records. Cross-checking will now be done on a periodic basis in an attempt to halt this abuse of the social security system.

However, the fraud uncovered by cross-checking may be just the tip of the iceberg. While there is some voluntary reporting of deaths by the families of beneficiaries, the SSA finds out about most beneficiary deaths from reports of funeral home directors. In the past, funeral home directors had an incentive to report deaths because many families would let the directors collect the lump-sum death benefit directly from SSA in partial payment for funeral expenses.

The Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 eliminated the lump-sum death benefit. As a result, it is likely that the number of deaths reported by directors will decrease steadily since their incentive to report is gone. This could create a large void in the ability of SSA to stop payments to people once they have died.

Another reason that the potential for fraud is so high is that in 1981, 31 percent of all social security benefits were directly deposited into bank accounts. Last year, 11 million benefit checks were automatically transferred from the Treasury to the beneficiaries' bank accounts, with no signature

needed. If a death is not reported, checks will continue to be deposited and those with access to the bank accounts can go on collecting the benefits.

How many of the direct deposit beneficiaries' deaths are unreported? How many deaths in total go unreported to SSA? No one really knows. But as the recent disclosure of the \$100 million scam illustrates, only 8,000 people out of 3 million recipients can be quite significant. As a result, effort spent in improving SSA's ability to eliminate such illegal activity could have a large impact.

Unfortunately, SSA has no systematic plan to deal with death fraud. There is, however, an easy and inexpensive way to eliminate this illegal activity, by using information that has already been collected. In particular, local governments keep records of all death certificates. The official State registrars in turn collect the records from local officials and record that information on standard computer tapes.

However, there is a problem in obtaining access to these death records. Many States have confidentiality laws that prohibit the public release of death information. If SSA gets the State records, anyone can sue for access to them under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). As a result, States would run the risk of violating their own confidentiality laws if they gave the tapes to SSA.

In response to this problem I have introduced H.R. 5188, which would provide a FOIA exclusion to SSA with regard to the death certificate data. This exclusion would fully protect the data from public disclosure. With this exclusion the States would be willing to give the data to SSA.

H.R. 5188 would also establish a data bank for use in getting dead people off the benefit roles. SSA would make voluntary contracts with the States to purchase the records on a periodic basis. The cost of producing the tapes would be partially shared by SSA. With the data bank in place, SSA could cross-check their beneficiary records with those listed as dead by the State registrars. If the computer showed someone was dead and collecting benefits, SSA could then double-check actual State records on a selected individual basis (this SSA can presently do) and see if in fact the person is dead. If so, he would be cut from the roles, and overpayment to him would be investigated.

My bill also provides SSA with the option of making arrangements to allow other Federal agencies to use the data bank to eliminate deceased people from their roles. Among potentially interested agencies would be the Office of Personnel Management, the Veterans' Administration, and the Railroad Retirement Board. SSA

would be reimbursed for the cost of such services.

There is precedent for a Federal agency contracting with the States to receive the death certificate tapes. The National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) currently contracts to receive these tapes for the National Death Index (NDI) it maintains. (The NDI is a statistical index only, with no names or social security numbers.) The center has a FOIA exclusion regarding the tapes, so that States would not violate their confidentiality laws. NCHS currently pays to the States 28 percent of the cost of compiling the tapes. Overall, the NCHS system is the successful model upon which my bill is based.

ALTERNATIVES

There are various alternatives to approaching the death fraud problem besides the one in my bill. One would be to reinstate the lump-sum death benefit. By even then there might be much undisclosed fraud. Another route would be to pay some set amount to funeral home directors for death report supplied; this is feasible but may prove too costly.

The other possibilities come down to some use of the State registrar tapes. Here there are three principal alternatives. One would be simply to require States to give SSA the tapes with a Freedom of Information Act exclusion similar to my bill. This is the approach taken in the only other bill to date addressing the death fraud issue, H.R. 5076, introduced by Representative LIVINGSTON.

There are several problems with a mandatory approach. The foremost is cost. Eight State registrars do not have the needed data on computer tape. If all States were required to participate in the death fraud data bank, these eight States would have to compile tapes, possibly at considerable expense to the States or the Federal Government. Under a voluntary system, States could gradually be brought into the system as their registrars found it worthwhile to produce the tapes. This gradual approach would be significantly more cost efficient.

Another problem with the mandatory approach is that some State constitutions expressly forbid the release of the death registrar data. These States would be forced to change their constitutions in order to comply with a law mandating their participation in the data bank.

States might also raise the issue that mandating their participation violates the Federal Constitution, which allows Federal law to be imposed on the States only under certain conditions. However, one instance where Federal law can supersede State law is when the Federal law is in the national interest. It can be argued that improving the social security system is in the na-

tional interest, because it improves the operation of the nationwide social security system.

A third problem with a mandatory approach is enforcement. Any mandatory bill would have to have a provision that would eliminate a State from social security programs if they did not supply the data tapes. While such an enforcement mechanism would probably prevent States from ignoring the requirement altogether, it is too blunt a mechanism to be used to insure speedy delivery and updating of the tapes. In a voluntary system incentives for prompt delivery and a minimum quality standard for the tapes could be built into the contracts between SSA and the States.

The NCHS contracts currently requires the tapes to be delivered within 90 days of death. The Director of Vital Statistics at NCHS believes this time lag can be reduced further by SSA through voluntary contracting. All considerations together, the Director feels the voluntary system would be most effective.

The voluntary system avoids all the above problems of a mandatory system. A voluntary system eliminates the constitutional issues. It is less costly because data tapes would only be compiled when it was worth the cost. And it would induce higher quality tapes and more expedient data delivery.

A second alternative using the data tapes is for SSA to obtain the tapes directly from NCHS. But this suggestion is opposed both by NCHS and the State registrars. The contracts for the data expressly stipulate that NCHS use the data only for scientific purposes. SSA could only get the data from NCHS if NCHS completely rewrote its contracts with the States. It is unlikely that the States would agree to recontract because SSA is not protected with a freedom-of-information exclusion. As a result, NCHS would have no data for its index.

A third alternative to my bill is to establish a separate "National Death Registry Center" specifically for administrative use. This idea has been discussed internally in several executive agencies. Under this proposal, a separate center, similar to NCHS, would be created and given an FOIA exclusion. This center would contract for the data tapes, maintain the data bank and contract with Federal agencies for the use of the data bank. Unfortunately, such a center would be costly to operate. Allowing SSA to do the same functions as the center, which is the case in my bill, should be much less expensive.

NEXT STEPS

While the costs of my proposal can be calculated, it is impossible to know how many people are fraudulently collecting benefits for those who have

died. Therefore it is impossible to know the benefits of obtaining the data tapes and setting up a data bank. However, if SSA can negotiate with a few of the States to obtain tapes and determine the amount of fraud in such a sample, they would have a good basis for determining whether to proceed along the lines I suggest. I believe it is probable that such an internal study will show net benefits in setting up a data bank, and I urge SSA to proceed with such a study.

Fraud in the social security system is intolerable, especially at this time of financial crisis. The efficient elimination of death fraud is an essential step.●

REMARKS ON PROPOSED TITLE V CUTBACKS

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my utter dismay at the administration's plans to eliminate funding in fiscal 1983 for a very worthy program. I am speaking of the senior community service employment program which falls under title V of the Older Americans Act.

By all accounts, the senior community service employment program or title V is a worthy and successful idea. It currently allows some 100 senior citizens in the Boston area and a total of over 54,000 nationwide to work in public service areas while receiving minimum wage for their labor. The jobs funded by this program include positions in hospitals, nursing homes, and even the national forest system.

Title V is a program free from either waste or fraud. Nationally, only \$1 out of every \$8 spent by the program goes for administrative costs, while the other \$7 has been channeled directly to wages and benefits for the elderly participants. I am told that the Boston program is even more efficient than the national average, with nearly 90 percent of its funds targeted into wages and benefits. President Reagan is fond of referring to the efficiency of the private sector in contrast to that of the Federal Government. Moreover, he proposes that a new spirit of volunteerism—some might call it an old habit of passing the buck—will spur business and individuals to take up many of the social responsibilities previously administered by the Federal Government. I would guess that volunteerism has a certain quaint appeal. However, record of the private sector is not always so admirable in supporting public service and other charitable endeavors. In calculating the efficiency of charitable organizations, the better business bureau endorses those

groups which spend anything less than 50 percent of their funds on administrative costs. Contrast that 50 percent figure with a government program which absorbs no more than 13 percent of its funding in administrative costs and you see why I am skeptical of this new volunteerism.

I do not want to suggest that title V is a charity; I want merely to compare its effectiveness with a comparable set of private organizations. In fact, the senior community service employment program is a dignified way to make senior citizens feel useful at the same time that they provide needed skills. Dignity is a word which seems to have slipped out of the vocabulary of this administration. Somehow the notion is too subtle to receive just treatment under the cold precision of cost-benefit analysis. But it may well be the most compelling reason for retaining the senior community service employment program. Tens of thousands of elderly people look upon title V as a way of accepting help without a corresponding loss of self-respect. In many cases, the alternative is a humiliating reliance on welfare. If the President harbors such great antipathy toward Government handouts, why must he eliminate alternatives such as title V?

Even if the administration chooses to ignore the humanitarian appeal of this program, it cannot afford to overlook the economic benefits. For such benefits do exist. There is strong reason to believe that the money saved by elimination of title V would be more than offset by increased demands on the social security system and lost tax revenues. The economic figures alone justify the continuation of title V.

At this point, I should note that while the fiscal 1983 budget eliminates specific funding for title V, a semblance of the program is scheduled to be retained under block grants. I refer to the administration's so-called special target program. With budgetary slight of hand, the administration intends to lump together allocations for workers, displaced workers, veterans, displaced homemakers, and older workers. All of these functions are to be carried out with an appropriation of \$200 million—less than the \$277 million outlay for space in the current program year. It will be impossible to tell how much of this money shall actually go toward the employment of needy senior citizens. The only certainty is that the figure will be a fraction of what is currently spent. This special targeted program is clearly and simply a way of avoiding responsibility for the well-being of those in need.

For rather obvious reasons, it would seem natural for President Reagan to be sympathetic with the Nation's elderly. After all, Mr. Reagan is a touch past middle age himself. But in prac-

tice, this country's oldest elected President appears to be ignorant of the plight of senior citizens. While the defense budget is swollen by new injections of tens of billions of dollars, social security and other programs beneficial to the elderly are being slashed indiscriminately. I—like most Americans—support the notion of a strong defense. But the Pentagon must not be given the luxury of making cost overruns and poor procurement decisions when this country's social programs are being scrutinized to the most minute expenditure. There is something blatantly inconsistent about eliminating a \$277 million appropriation for title V when the Army is purchasing a \$2.4 million tank that does not work, an overpriced attack helicopter which crashed while in the prototype stage, and the Navy is buying a \$32 million fighter which has failed to meet its original design requirements. I have no doubt that we can follow a more rational set of spending priorities.

America's senior citizens have been neglected for too long. They lead a precarious existence as they cope with inflation on the one hand, and declining earning potential on the other. It seems unfair that our elderly should work long and hard only to find themselves impoverished in their golden years. The senior community services employment program has been a source of hope for these people. The plight of the elderly should not become submerged under the rhetoric of a doctrinaire economic program.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's senior citizens must not be forgotten.●

HIGH TECHNOLOGY AND EDUCATION: MORE COOPERATION NEEDED

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the recently published study, "How Education is Responding to High-Technology Industry" should be of concern to anyone interested in high-technology industries, one of the fastest growing sectors of our economy. After a year's research in California's "Silicon Valley," Dr. Elizabeth Useem, associate professor of sociology at Boston State College, found virtually no communication between the area's high-technology industry and the public school systems. Where one might have expected innovative vocational training with strong industry support, she found programs plagued by budget cuts and a general unwillingness to start new courses for fear of additional reductions. In general, she

found that the schools had taken no action to respond to the electronic revolution going on about them.

Dr. Useem's findings do not bode well for an industry dependent upon a highly skilled work force or the national economy which will depend on this industry for growth in the next decade. I will soon introduce legislation to amend the Vocational Education Act to stimulate industry and public school collaboration for electronics and computer training.

I commend this study to my colleagues.

[From the Education Daily, Jan. 11, 1982]

**INDUSTRY AND EDUCATION COOPERATE—OR
FAIL TO COOPERATE**
(By Elizabeth Useem)

Like most other businesses in the state, high technology industry has not been an active participant in shaping educational policy in the [California] state legislature.

In fact, Silicon Valley firms, with a few exceptions, have been even less concerned with public education than have other business sectors.

Some observers explain that these companies, many of them new and rapidly growing concerns, have been so busy developing and marketing their own products they have not had the personnel or energy to think about broader social issues. Compared with more established traditional companies, they lag in contributions to and involvement in the arts and charitable organizations.

Others feel that there is so much competition among companies for personnel (and sometimes for product markets as well) that it is difficult for them to unite on questions of schooling policy—or on almost any social issue, for that matter.

Only recently have they been organized by the Santa Clara County Manufacturing Group to work on local needs in housing, transportation and energy.

**HIGH TECHNOLOGY'S LOW PROFILE ON
EDUCATION**

A recent statewide business/education conference sponsored by the powerful California Roundtable had few high technology participants. Similarly, these firms' absence from state IEC initiatives indicates their low profile on educational matters.

The high technology companies were largely silent on Proposition 13 and Proposition 9, the two major tax-cutting proposals on the ballot since 1978.

An effort in the early months of 1981 by educators at San Jose State University and the San Mateo County Office of Education to mobilize Silicon Valley industry support for improved science education resulted in three meetings characterized by low turnout (only 15 of 100 companies responded) and little consensus on remedies.

There is some variation among the high technology companies in the intensity and scope of their interest in public education.

Some firms are concerned only with developing a specific labor supply for their companies' short-term needs, whereas other businesses take a broader view of school functions that stress the need for an intelligent citizenry.

Some companies make token efforts to help schools, but do so only to embellish

their own community image. Many in the industry want to improve ties with schools but do not know how to go beyond traditional participation in career days and plant tours.

THERE IS SOME HELP

To be sure, there are some successful programs in Santa Clara Valley linking schools and industry, in addition to those supported by the local industry-Education Council.

For example, IBM has inservice training days for local vocational education teachers, it sends employees to teach economics courses in junior high schools as part of "Project Business," and it takes a leadership role in "Junior Achievement" programs in high schools.

Intel has donated equipment to local high schools, sponsors science fairs, and plans a more intensive effort to communicate the industry's needs to high school counselors.

Seven companies in the area (and possibly as many as 12 eventually) have contributed the equivalent of \$400,000 in loaned personnel and equipment to set up schools-within-a-school in two nearby San Mateo County high schools.

The project, sponsored by the Mid-Peninsula Urban Coalition, will focus on teaching computer technology and electronics technology to potential high school dropouts.

Signetics is planning to support an inservice summer training program in semiconductor technology for high schools electronics teachers in cooperation with San Jose State University.

Of all the companies headquartered in the Valley, Hewlett-Packard is the undisputed leader in fostering industry-education ties.

William Hewlett and David Packard have a longstanding personal interest in education; their interest has left its mark on company policy. David Packard, for instance, spent 10 years on the Palo Alto Board of Education.

Unlike most companies, Hewlett-Packard has a number of full-time employees who devote substantial portions of their time to improving their contact with public schools.

A committee of top executives is currently examining ways in which the firm and the industry can provide more support for public education. It has lobbied for increased expenditures of state funds for education and was the only high technology company in the Valley to donate money in opposition to Proposition 13.

Among other projects, it has loaned personnel and given equipment in support of a new drafting curriculum being developed at East Side Union High School District in San Jose and the programs in computer and electronics technology sponsored by the Urban Coalition. Gifted students from high schools in the Fremont Union High School District use Hewlett-Packard labs at night for computer training classes.

Intensive career awareness programs at several area high schools have been organized by the company, and it has fostered an "adopt-a-school" relationship at two Santa Clara high schools. Company officials have been instrumental in building the local Industry-Education council.

BUT NOT A LOT

With the exception of Hewlett-Packard (IBM is often mentioned), high technology firms have devoted little effort to supporting the Valley's public schools and cultivat-

ing its long-term labor supply. While company executives are increasingly concerned about personnel shortages and the deteriorating quality of public education, they do not view education as a high-priority issue.

Moreover, most firms do not seem sympathetic to increased state funding for schools, particularly if it leads to higher taxes.

Many feel that California schools are so poorly managed that administrators would waste any additional monies that were provided.

They believe that school officials are not sufficiently aware of the demand for high technology personnel and the consequent need to change school curricula and student career awareness. Some executives also claimed that school officials are also difficult to work with because they are too slow to change. Many deplored the impact of teachers' collective bargaining efforts on the school environment.

Rather than lobbying for an increased and stable source of funding for schools, executives would rather focus company efforts on providing support for high technology programs in specific schools.

It is possible, however, that greater support for California public education may eventually be forthcoming from a newly formed task force of the California Roundtable, a group which represent the largest firms from all business sectors in the state.

A few company officials were sympathetic to the financial condition of public schools. One exasperated manager, who has long been interested in building ties to public schools, accused his company (and others) of being greedy and self-protective.

"The companies are always looking for an immediate return on their investment" when they contribute to educational programs, he claimed. Indeed, one company official admitted that the firm built close ties to schools only when personnel shortages were greater, and then loosened those ties during recessionary periods.

The situation is perceived much the same way by educators, who argue that industry has an overly narrow conception of education, is short-sighted and only concerned with immediate profits, and ultimately could not be trusted.

"I wouldn't count on industry for anything," said one administrator. They felt that industry had profited from Proposition 13 and had done little with those tax savings to help the schools.

Educators are acutely aware that industry leaders hold them in low regard. ("Industry thinks we are monumentally screwing up," admitted one assistant superintendent.)

Almost all of those in industry and education who have worked together on collaborative efforts point to the difficulty in overcoming these barriers that exist between them.

The mutual suspicions and organizational obstacles which have characterized business-education relations over the years are nothing new.

What is new is the shift in the nation's economy toward high technology and the growing demand for well-educated personnel.

Yet if Silicon Valley is any example, neither the schools themselves nor industry is taking major steps to strengthen existing programs or develop new ones that reflect this economic transformation. ●

LOOKING FOR REVENUES

HON. RALPH REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be widespread agreement that the President's proposed deficits are too large, even though the President is proposing and assuming an unprecedented deficit-reduction program. Now that the President has "proposed," it is time for Congress to "dispose," in the true spirit of the principle of the separation of powers.

I believe that for any deficit-reduction program to be enacted, the savings must be gained from both the revenue and spending sides of the budget.

This first table shows how the administration's deficit-reduction program divides between savings resulting from reducing spending and savings resulting from increasing revenues. What strikes me is that the proportion

is lopsided—four-fifths (79 percent) of the proposed deficit reduction over the next 3 years would come from the outlay side of the budget.

TABLE 1.—COMPOSITION OF PRESIDENT'S DEFICIT-REDUCTION PLAN BETWEEN REVENUES AND SPENDING

[Dollar amounts in billions]¹

	Fiscal year—						3-yr total	
	1983		1984		1985		Amount	Percent
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent		
Deficit without any changes from current services	\$147		\$167		\$171		\$485	
President's deficit	92		83		72		247	
Required savings	56		84		99		239	
Resulting from:								
Revenue enhancements	13	23	19	23	19	19	51	21
Spending cuts from current service	43	77	65	77	81	81	188	79

¹ Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding.

Source: The budget of the U.S. Government, fiscal year 1983.

As one who feels that reducing deficits is important and crucial to economic recovery, I believe that a fair share of any deficit-reducing program must come from increased revenues.

Where can additional revenue savings be found? At this stage of the congressional budget process, it is appropriate to explore general categories.

Accordingly, I have prepared a second table, based on estimates made by the Joint Committee on Taxation, which shows by broad tax categories not only how the tax-cut bidding contest resulted in the largest tax cut in history, but also the composition of the various tax bills by broad category.

TABLE 2.—REVENUE IMPACTS OF TAX LEGISLATION, FISCAL YEARS 1981-86¹

[In billions of dollars]

Proposal	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	Total
1. H.R. 2400: ^a							
Individual:							
(a) Rate Reduction (10-10-10)	-6.4	-44.2	-81.4	-118.1	-141.5	-162.4	-554.0
Business:							
(b) Accelerated cost recovery	-2.5	-9.7	-18.6	-30.0	-44.2	-59.3	-164.3
Total, (H.R. 2400)	-8.9	-53.9	-100.0	-148.1	-185.7	-221.7	-718.3
2. H.R. 3849 (Conable-Hance):							
Individual:							
(a) Rate reduction (5-10-10)		-25.7	-64.4	-104.3	-121.1	-139.0	-454.5
(b) All other individual	(*)	-2.6	-10.4	-15.5	-17.6	-21.0	-67.1
Total, (a) + (b)	(*)	-28.3	-74.8	-119.8	-138.7	-160.0	-521.6
Business:							
(c) Accelerated cost recovery (10-5-3)	-2.1	-8.9	-17.3	-28.3	-41.9	-63.9	-162.4
(d) All other business	(*)	-8	-1.3	-1.5	-1.6	-1.7	-6.9
Total, (c) + (d)	-2.1	-9.7	-18.6	-29.8	-43.5	-65.6	-169.3
Total, H.R. 3849	-2.1	-38.0	-93.4	-149.6	-182.2	-225.6	-690.9
3. H.R. 4242 (Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981):							
Individual:							
(a) Rate reduction (5-10-10)		-25.8	-65.7	-104.5	-122.6	-143.8	-462.4
(b) All other individual	(*)	-1.1	-5.4	-10.2	-25.6	-52.3	-94.6
Total, (a) + (b)	(*)	-26.9	-71.1	-114.7	-148.2	-196.1	-557.0
Business:							
(c) Accelerated cost recovery (15-10-5-3)	-1.5	-9.6	-16.8	-26.2	-37.3	-52.8	-144.2
(d) All other business *	-1	-1.1	-1.9	-2.2	-2.1	-1.9	-9.3
Total, (c) + (d)	-1.6	-10.7	-18.7	-28.4	-39.4	-54.7	-153.5
Other provisions:							
(e) Energy	-1.3	-1.7	-2.2	-2.8	-3.6	-11.6	-29.2
(f) All others *	(*)	-1.3	-1.1	-4.6	-8.7	-13.3	-29.2
Total, (e) + (f)	(*)	0	-2.8	-6.8	-11.5	-16.9	-38.2
Total, H.R. 4242	-1.6	-37.6	-92.7	-150.0	-199.2	-267.7	-748.7

¹ Data source: Joint Committee on Taxation (some numbers may not add to totals due to rounding).

* Less than \$50,000,000.

* Excludes proposed user fees.

* Excluding energy provisions.

* Savings, estate and gift tax, tax straddles, administrative, and miscellaneous provisions.

Table 2 compares the revenue effects of H.R. 2400 (original administration proposal), H.R. 3849 (revised administration proposal, Conable-Hance), and H.R. 4242 (enacted Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981.)

Note that H.R. 4242's provisions unrelated to individual or business taxes ("e" and "f" in the table) result in estimated revenue losses of \$38 billion through 1986, with an \$11.6 billion

loss attributable to energy provisions alone.

Note that differences between the three tax bills do not show up until 1986. For 1986, estimated revenue losses soar from \$221.7 billion (H.R.

2400) to \$267.7 billion (H.R. 4242), a jump of \$46 billion.

Table 2 also reveals how revenue losses increased in categories outside the two originally proposed by the administration (individual rate reductions and capital cost recovery). For example, while the original "10-10-10" was reduced to a less costly "5-10-10" for a savings of approximately \$100 billion, new individual tax provisions would have resulted in an additional \$67 billion of revenue losses (H.R. 3849) and results in a projected loss of \$94.6 billion (H.R. 4242). Additional business tax reductions, on top of the basic cost recovery provisions, would have added nearly \$7 billion in revenue losses (H.R. 3849) and are now projected to exceed \$9 billion (H.R. 4242).

We hear a lot of discussion about not tampering with "future" tax cuts. Yet, we have already seen that the expectational impact of the recently enacted tax cuts is certainly no more than the anticipative impact of previous tax cuts. Tax changes on the books but not yet effective should not be treated as inviolate.

Table 2 excludes a large and significant area of revenue loss—"tax expenditures." Estimates vary, but most will agree that the revenue losses resulting from tax expenditures will exceed \$200 billion next year. This is about one third of total expected receipts, and more than twice the administration's proposed deficit.

Reducing revenue losses from tax expenditures should appeal to the most ardent supply sider. Why? Because, by definition, removing tax breaks which benefit only small segments of society broadens the tax base (a basic supply-side goal), thereby paving the way for future (perhaps simultaneous) across-the-board tax reductions (another basic supply-side objective).

Mr. Speaker, my purpose here is not to offer specific revenue-raising proposals. It is too early in the congressional process for specifics. I am merely presenting revenue-related information which this body should be examining at this time. Hopefully, these data will inform my colleagues and generate and stimulate debate and ideas toward arriving at the best fiscal policy.●

CONSUMER ENERGY RELIEF ACT

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, the skyrocketing price of natural gas is aggravating the already enormous problem of unemployment in the economically

depressed portions of our country. In my home State of Michigan, the natural gas distributing utility in the city of Detroit has approximately a 50 percent uncollectable rate for its residential users. The long-term unemployment, the endless increases in gas prices, and the brutal savagery of this winter have left countless people in the situation of "heat or eat."

How can any Congressman explain to their constituents that the price of natural gas has but one destiny, to drastically increase. The reason natural gas prices endlessly rise is because Congress has made no provision for prices to decrease.

In response to this serious and dangerous problem, I am introducing four consumer energy relief acts. Two of these measures deal with natural gas supply contracting provisions. The third measure seeks to encourage greater energy conservation measures, and the fourth addresses a small residential energy task problem. The natural gas contracts problem is an extremely complex topic which requires a brief understanding of the history of Federal natural gas regulation.

The Natural Gas Policy Act is a law which has been mislabeled regulatory legislation. It is actually incentive or promotional legislation to encourage production of new reserves of natural gas. In contrast, the Natural Gas Act of 1936, which created the Federal Power Commission, would be considered classical regulatory legislation. The rates set for natural gas prices were based on the cost of production plus a just and reasonable profit. This rate model is a theoretical approximation of pricing theory in a truly competitive market. There were numerous problems with the administration of the act of 1936. These problems were illustrated in the congressional hearings on the Natural Gas Policy Act. In addition, the gas shortages of the mid-1970's highlighted the regulatory shortcomings of that act.

What, then, was the pricing mechanism upon which the Natural Gas Policy Act was based? Pricing is designed to encourage exploration and production of new reserves as well as tying the market price to a comparable fuel of similar heating capability. For the purpose of the act, the index fuel is sometimes No. 2 and sometimes No. 6 heating oil. To minimize the impact of a change to a producer-incentive price from a regulated price based on ideal free market conditions, complex formulas of wellhead pricing provisions were established for eight types of natural gas production. These formulas included escalator and inflation factors designed to smoothly bring the price of natural gas up to that of index fuel oil over an 8-year period.

As originally contemplated by the Natural Gas Policy Act, the projected

price of heating oil was estimated at \$15 a barrel in 1985. This is where the producer incentive pricing system broke down. The price of oil has been in the effective control of foreign-dominated cartels since the early 1970's. The pricing policies of this cartel are not based upon either the cost of production plus a fair and reasonable return or a producer-incentive price. Cartel pricing is based upon controlling production and supply to extract maximum premiums. When revolution devastated Iran and terminated oil and gas production, the price of oil doubled and now currently hovers around \$35 a barrel. The pricing formulas of the Natural Gas Policy Act followed the inflationary curve of oil, skyrocketing upward.

Fundamentally, there is absolutely nothing to force any downward pressure on natural gas prices. There are also contracting provisions between gas producers and pipelines, and pipelines and utilities which strongly reinforce the upward pricing spiral. This effect is the so-called price spike. The general concerns of advocates and adversaries of natural gas decontrol is that there will be further spike effects ranging between 60 percent to 100 percent should decontrol occur.

As stated above, these price spikes take place because Congress in passing the Natural Gas Policy Act, did not take into account possible disruptions in world energy prices, nor did Congress provide any mechanism to give downward pricing pressure. In the arcane world of natural gas regulation, there are certain identifiable factors which support the price spiral. Among these factors are escalator clauses, favored nations or field price clauses, and take or pay provisions. These devices appear uniformly in contracts between producers and pipelines and also between pipelines and utilities. Utilities then secure price adjustment allowances from State utility regulatory commissions. The effect this complex web of contracting provisions is to pass the price of the highest cost gas from producer to consumer in the fastest possible manner. That is why gas prices go up constantly.

Without entering the fray of decontrol versus contained control of natural gas, there are concrete proposals which the Congress can act upon to greatly slow the rapid increases in natural gas prices. I am proposing to suspend all escalator, favored nation, or field price clauses in natural gas sale or purchase contracts. Furthermore, it would address take-or-pay provisions by prohibiting minimum energy purchase requirements unless such requirements are absolutely essential to make a specific supply of energy economically feasible. In addition, such requirements are to continue only so

long as it is necessary to amortize that specific supply of energy.

The first two measures of the Consumer Energy Relief Acts are essential because these contracting provisions make natural gas supply contracts enforceable only for volume. Purchasers have no control, more certainty of price under currently existing market contract conditions. Pipelines, utilities, and ultimate users must ransom any certainty of price for certainty of volume. There is no incentive to reduce gas prices. The first two consumer energy relief acts seek to provide that incentive.

The third and fourth portions of the consumer energy relief acts involve increased incentives for conservation activities and clarifying a problem with municipal utility taxes. Part 3 of the consumer energy relief acts increases the amount of tax credit from 15 percent to 40 percent of the first \$3,000 for residential energy conservation expenditures. The fourth and final portion of the energy relief acts corrects a gap in the Internal Revenue Code which does not allow deductions for payment of municipal utility taxes.

It is my hope that the Consumer Energy Relief Act will be a constructive way to make an essential resource like natural gas accessible to our citizens at a reasonable and fair price.●

BREAKFAST FOR THE NEW YORK CITY CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1982

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, Joseph V. Terenzio, president of the United Hospital Fund of New York delivered remarks to the New York City Congressional Delegation concerning the state of hospitals and health care in New York City. I think his thoughtful summation of the problems of health care in an urban area would be of use to us all, so I take this opportunity to share his remarks with you.

REMARKS OF JOSEPH V. TEREZIO

In 1980, total health care expenditures in the United States reached a quarter of a trillion dollars. Of this amount, expenditures for hospital care accounted for 40% or \$100 billion, and have been rising particularly rapidly. In the one year period from 1979 to 1980, the increase in hospital costs was 16.2%. This escalation in health care costs in recent years has greatly exceeded our general economic growth. In 1929, health care costs constituted only 3.5% of our Gross National Product; currently it is approaching 10%. Thus, the health care market can be best described by some as a "bull market," and by others as a stampede, depending upon the observers' relative perspectives.

Unlike public relation to growth in most industries, the escalation in health care expenditures has been viewed with concern by policymakers and the general public. Although no one questions the value of health, the rising costs of health services, combined with increased budgetary pressures, are forcing public officials to question the appropriateness and the desirability of these large expenditures. In recent years a variety of methods to contain these rising costs have been tried. This year, regionalization, increased competition, federalization and capping of Medicaid, and changes in tax law are being debated as means of achieving these ends.

Formulating appropriate health care policy for New York City hospitals requires a clear understanding of their complex and multifaceted roles. The city's hospitals serve the entire nation as leaders in the quality and sophistication of patient care, medical education, and research, while at the same time they are faced with the challenge of serving the millions of local residents who need hospital care. Even on a local level, though, the geographic concentration of hospital facilities, superimposed on a mosaic of diverse patient needs, makes it difficult to identify the population groups served by our individual hospitals. The United Hospital Fund, as you will hear this morning, has begun to identify these groups. I strongly feel that health policy must be sensitive to the tension between a hospital's goal of serving its immediate community with a full range of basic services and the often competing goal of serving a wider audience with an added measure of excellence in selected specialty areas. The conflict between these goals is intensified by special health care needs of New York City residents, their ethnic diversity, and the city's large population of poor and aged, all of which create a uniquely demanding responsibility for New York City hospitals. At the same time hospitals are confronted by an austere financial situation.

The document presented to you today, *Communities, Hospitals, and Health Care: The Role of New York City Hospitals in Serving Their Neighborhoods* and the Nation attempts to address these concerns by helping you and other policymakers better understand the complex role played by hospitals in New York City and the role played by New York City in providing health care resources for the nation. I think you will find it to be an important new tool, useful to you in making policy through legislation and in better understanding your district and the city.

However, I believe that you will find that this document also provides you with more than a new reference resource. Our study provides important new insights which, I believe, shatter a number of popular beliefs about New York. For example, the study questions the common assertions that New Yorkers use hospitals excessively and that the city has an overabundance of hospitals and hospital beds. In point of fact, when compared to national averages and other major cities, New Yorkers really are not unique when it comes to their use of hospitals and the number of hospital beds available to them.

Contrary to popular belief, our hospitals are running near full capacity yet our people are not overusing health care resources when you look at how many hospital beds are available, how many are filled, and how often they are used. New York City hospitals' occupancy rate is 13% higher

than the national average and our people's use rate is 10% lower.

Communities, Hospitals, and Health Care points out that in absolute terms, New York City does have far more hospitals, beds, and special care units than any other city in the United States. Its municipal hospital system, which has 12 general care hospitals with 6,000 beds, is unparalleled in size or scope anywhere in the country. However, in relative measure, the study also reveals that New York City's supply of hospital beds, at 4.6 beds per thousand population, does not appear excessive relative to its large population and when compared to other cities, such as Detroit with 7.4, Chicago and Philadelphia with 6.3, and to the national average of 4.4. The inferences I draw from these facts are made even more powerful when coupled with the fact that New York City is a national center for health care and educates twice as many medical students and provides three times as much specialty training for physicians as would be expected based on its population. Using national norms, the analysis also points out that New York City hospital beds appear to be efficiently used, with an average occupancy rate of 85.9% compared to a national rate of 75.6%, and an inpatient utilization rate of 137.9 discharges per thousand population, which is substantially lower than the national rate of 154.2 per thousand.

Another popular misconception about New York City is that it has far too many physicians. Our study indicates that although the city does have a relatively abundant supply of practicing physicians representing virtually every specialty and subspecialty area, the city's share of the nation's supply of physicians has declined from 8.1% to 5.3% over the past decade. Increasingly our hospitals have become the family physician for many of our residents. No doubt this is due, in large part, to the fact that the city's supply of general practitioners in office-based practice has decreased over the last ten years by 50%, compared to a national decline of only 6%. Also, despite the fact that New York City has slightly more office-based physicians per thousand population (1.6) contrasted to the national average (of 1.2), the availability of physicians varies greatly among the boroughs. For example, in Manhattan there are 4.2 office-based physicians per thousand population, while the Bronx has .9. In fact, several neighborhoods within the city have so few physicians that they have been designated Medically Underserved Areas by the Federal Government. The residents of these areas are often dependent on our local hospitals for physician care.

The city's disproportionately large share of the Nation's poor and near poor, restrictive eligibility standards for Medicaid coverage, and stringent hospital reimbursement policies under the Medicaid program, place heavy demands on the hospitals in our city. I firmly believe that to preserve the leadership and excellence of our hospitals, health policy must be sensitive to these special burdens.

A statement that we frequently hear, and which I would also place in the myth category, is that the principal role of hospitals is to serve their own neighborhoods. Our study indicates that many patients travel for care. More than one half of all patients discharged from Manhattan hospitals came from outside the borough, and looking at the city as a whole, nearly one out of every five city residents discharged from hospitals

in 1978 did not live in the borough in which their hospital stay occurred.

Yet another misconception dispelled by our study is that New York City is a welfare haven. On the contrary, our study indicates that the eligibility level for Medicaid coverage in New York, when adjusted for inflation, has declined by two-thirds since the program began in 1966.

You, as makers of health policy through legislation, must not base health policy decisions on traditional beliefs about New York City and New Yorkers. Our report suggests that a number of these beliefs simply are not founded on fact.

I have cited facts which contravene these popular misconceptions, not only for their content, but also as examples of the types of information provided in our special study and how it can be used in better understanding your district and New York City. Communities, Hospitals, and Health Care examines New York City as a center of excellence in health care by describing and comparing with other cities its unique role in providing medical education, research, and health care, both locally and for the nation. It unites for the first time an unparalleled patient origin data base, the 1980 census and congressional districts into a new tool for policy decision responsive to people and communities in New York City, and reveals a diversity on health care needs and practices. A unique geographic portrayal provides neighborhood utilization rates never before available and identifies which hospitals people in your district depend upon for inpatient services, and which hospitals in your district are serving people from other congressional districts. A special chapter and a detailed appendix provide you with specific information about your district and where your constituents go for hospital care.

I think you will find it intriguing to know that use of hospitals varies greatly among the boroughs and among the neighborhoods within the boroughs. Many factors may be involved in this variation, particularly the socio-economic status of the population and the availability of other health care resources. For example, the study indicates that:

Among the boroughs, the Bronx had the highest rate of discharges per thousand population (155.1); this was followed by Manhattan (150.6); Brooklyn (144.2); Staten Island (118.5); and Queens (114.1). The Bronx also had the fewest office-based physicians relative to population.

Two neighborhoods, the South Bronx and East Harlem, had over 180 discharges per thousand population. In contrast, two neighborhoods in Queens and one in Staten Island had between 80 and 100 discharges per thousand population.

Particularly relevant to any discussion of such concepts as regionalization of health facilities or changes in "freedom of choice" for Medicaid recipients is the role New York City hospitals play in serving patients who reside outside the city and serving city residents who seek hospital care outside their own neighborhoods. In formulating policy regarding hospital capacity and location, it is important to consider that 11% of patients discharged from New York City hospitals live outside the city and more than 50% of the patients discharged from Manhattan hospitals live outside the borough. Almost one-fifth of city residents hospitalized in 1978 went outside their borough for this care, mostly to Manhattan hospitals. These findings would indicate that patients'

patterns of seeking care are, to a great extent, independent of traditional borough and neighborhood boundaries; therefore, I would suggest that the various roles of health institutions should be considered from a broad geographic perspective as well as the neighborhood viewpoint. Stated in another way, the assumption that hospitals serve first and foremost their own neighborhood and community is unfounded. Many patients travel for care and hospitals serve significant numbers of people from outside their borough as well as patients from within the community.

The complexities of our health care system in New York City also require that attention be paid to hospital auspice as well as location. Our study reveals a marked variation in the way city residents and non-residents use voluntary, municipal, and proprietary hospitals. Additionally, city residents' use of these hospitals differs according to whether they seek care in their own borough or outside their borough. Our analysis shows that municipal hospitals serve primarily New Yorkers and that voluntary hospitals serve not only New Yorkers but also the majority of patients coming into the city from other locations. In addition, the study indicates that proprietary hospitals have an intimate relationship with the borough in which they are located, drawing almost their entire inpatient population from that borough. Highlights from this section of the analysis include the following observations:

Sixty-seven percent of the city residents hospitalized in 1978 were discharged from voluntary hospitals; in contrast, nearly 92 percent of non-residents were discharged from such facilities.

Twenty-three percent of all resident discharges were from municipal hospitals; only three percent of non-resident discharges were from municipal hospitals.

Among residents of all the boroughs who remained in their borough for care, residents of Staten Island, which has no municipal hospitals, and residents of Manhattan were most likely to use voluntary hospitals. Bronx residents were the most likely to use municipal hospitals and Queens residents were the most likely to use proprietary hospitals.

I am confident that as Congressmen you will find Chapter IV of the study most enlightening and useful. It describes the hospitals that serve the residents of each of the city's 18 congressional districts and also depicts the pattern of patients traveling outside their neighborhoods for hospital care. Tables identifying the ten hospitals most frequently used by the residents of each district are presented and show that patients often use hospitals outside their district and even outside their borough. As you should know, public policy and political advocacy must respond to the role hospitals play in serving patients who leave their districts for care.

The role of hospitals in serving your constituents can be viewed in two ways: on the one hand, what percent of all patients discharged from each district are served by a particular hospital, and on the other hand, what percent of the hospital's patients are district residents. For example, in eight of the congressional districts, a single hospital has accounted for one-fifth or more of discharges for constituents of the district. Smaller hospitals, however, would rarely be among the two or three most frequently used hospitals, even though they may be predominantly serving residents of the dis-

trict. Therefore, separate figures are presented which show that district residents often account for 50% or more of the particular hospital's patient discharges.

A complete understanding of an individual hospital's role in the community requires understanding both of these perspectives.

The information and analysis presented in Communities, Hospitals, and Health Care clearly illustrate the diversity and complexity of the various roles our hospitals play. The methods and tools utilized in it are important steps for serving current health policy development, and also for setting the stage for a full range of systematic analysis of health care policy and management issues in the years to come. It is for these reasons that I am most pleased to present you with Communities, Hospitals, and Health Care: The Role of New York City Hospitals in Serving Their Neighborhoods and the Nation. This document will add to your resources of information on New York City hospitals and health care system. It represents another example of the United Hospital Fund's traditional and expanding role in the area of health policy information and publications. If you have any questions or suggestions, we are available to answer your inquiries and provide information concerning the health care issues of New York City.

Thank you.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 2, 1982, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 3

8:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for non-Indian programs.

1224 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.

Armed Services**Tactical Warfare Subcommittee**

To hold closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Army tactical programs.

212 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations**Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations**State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee**

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Justice.

S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation**Surface Transportation Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on S. 671, providing for comprehensive alcohol-traffic safety programs, and other related proposals.

235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15, and the nomination of Cathie A. Shattuck, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Business meeting, to consider those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

324 Russell Building

Budget

To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.

6202 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to continue consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

4200 Dirksen Building

Finance

Business meeting, to continue consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations**International Economic Policy Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on a United States assertion of extraterritoriality with respect to the Soviet-European gas pipeline.

4221 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting, to consider those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

412 Russell Building

MARCH 4

9:00 a.m.

Armed Services**Tactical Warfare Subcommittee**

To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Army tactical programs and other procurement.

212 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

***Appropriations**

To resume hearings to review current economic conditions.

1114 Russell Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs**International Finance and Monetary Policy Subcommittee**

To hold oversight hearings on barriers to U.S. trade.

5302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary*Criminal Law Subcommittee**

To hold hearings to examine efforts by Federal agencies to impose tighter restrictions on the sale of hand guns.

5110 Dirksen Building

***Small Business**

To hold hearings on S. 1947, improving small businesses access to Federal procurement information.

424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations**HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the American Battle Monuments Commission, Army Cemetery Expenses, the Office of Consumer Affairs, and Consumer Information Center.

1224 Dirksen Building

Budget

To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.

6202 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to continue consideration of those matters and programs

in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of Peter H. Dailey, of California, to be Ambassador to Ireland.

4221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Business meeting, to consider those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

3302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary**Security and Terrorism Subcommittee**

To resume hearings on terrorist and intelligence activities of the Cuban Government in Miami, Fla.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to continue consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

3110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations**Foreign Operations Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of Inspector General, Agency for International Development.

S-146, Capitol

MARCH 5

9:00 a.m.

Budget

To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.

6202 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

***Appropriations**

To continue hearings to review current economic conditions.

1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to continue consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations**East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee**

Closed briefing by officials of the Department of State on the status of POW's and MIA's.

S-116, Capitol

Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the employment/
unemployment situation for the
month of February.

Room to be announced

10:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Investigations and General Oversight Sub-
committee

To hold oversight hearings on activities
of the National Cancer Institute and
the Food and Drug Administration,
Department of Health and Human
Services.

4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Edu-
cation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1983 for human
development services of the Depart-
ment of Health and Human Services.

1318 Dirksen Building

MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on H.R. 3663, proposed
Bus Regulatory Reform Act of 1981,
and on the deregulation of the inter-
city bus industry.

235 Russell Building

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the De-
partment of Education's impact aid
program for Indians.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Budget
To resume hearings in preparation for
reporting the first concurrent resolu-
tion for fiscal year 1983 setting forth
recommended levels of total budget
outlays, Federal revenues, and new
budget authority.

6202 Dirksen Building

Finance
To resume hearings to review those
items in the President's budget for
fiscal year 1983 which fall within its
legislative jurisdiction and consider
recommendations which it will make
thereon to the Budget Committee.

2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the current situa-
tion in Afghanistan.

4221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Budget

To continue hearings in preparation for
reporting the first concurrent resolu-
tion for fiscal year 1983 setting forth
recommended levels of total budget
outlays, Federal revenues, and new
budget authority.

6202 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcom-
mittee

To hold oversight hearings to review the
capacity, distribution and status of the
Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

3110 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on the proposed
budget estimates for the intelligence
community.

S-407, Capitol

Select on Intelligence
Budget Subcommittee

To hold closed hearings on proposed leg-
islation authorizing funds for fiscal

year 1983 for intelligence activities of
the United States.

S-407, Capitol

MARCH 9

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1983 for the
Economic Regulatory Administration
and the Energy Information Adminis-
tration, Department of Energy

1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Sub-
committee

To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1983 for the Ag-
ricultural Research Service, Coopera-
tive State Research Service, Extension
Service, and the National Agricultural
Library, Department of Agriculture.

1318 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation
unifying and clarifying the product li-
ability tort law.

235 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcom-
mittee

To resume hearings on proposed legisla-
tion authorizing funds for the Nation-
al aeronautics and Space Administra-
tion.

6226 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee

Business meeting, to consider S. 1785, in-
creasing the penalties for violations of
the Taft-Hartley Act, requiring imme-
diate removal of certain individuals
convicted of crimes relating to his offi-
cial position, broadening the definition
of the types of positions an individual
is barred from upon conviction, in-
creasing the time if disbarment from 5
to 10 years, escrowing a convicted offi-
cial's salary for the duration of his
appeal, and clarifying the jurisdiction
of the Department of Labor relating
to detection and investigating criminal
violations relating to ERISA.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1983 and pro-
posed supplemental appropriations for
fiscal year ending September 30, 1982
for the Secretary of Transportation.

1124 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of
proposed amendments to the Clean
Air Act (Public Law 95-95).

4200 Dirksen Building

Finance
To continue hearings to review those
items in the President's budget for
fiscal year 1983 which fall within its
legislative jurisdiction and consider
recommendations which it will make
thereon to the Budget Committee.

2221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to review the Presi-
dent's proposals on New Federalism.

3302 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
To continue closed hearings on the pro-
posed budget estimates for the intelli-
gence community.

S-407, Capitol

Select on Intelligence
Budget Subcommittee

To continue closed hearings on proposed
legislation authorizing funds for fiscal
year 1983 for intelligence activities of
the United States.

S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Edu-
cation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1983 for the
Health Care Financing Administra-
tion, Department of Health and
Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for
reporting the first concurrent resolu-
tion for fiscal year 1983 setting forth
recommended levels of total budget
outlays, Federal revenues, and new
budget authority.

6202 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
To continue closed hearings on the pro-
posed budget estimates for the intelli-
gence community.

S-407, Capitol

Select on Intelligence
Budget Subcommittee

To continue closed hearings on proposed
legislation authorizing funds for fiscal
year 1983 for intelligence activities of
the United States.

S-407, Capitol

MARCH 10

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Research and General Legis-
lation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 2109, authoriz-
ing funds for the Commodity Futures
Trading Commission.

324 Russell Building

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judici-
ary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1983 for the Im-
migration and Naturalization Service,
Drug Enforcement Administration,
and the Bureau of Prisons.

S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine certain fi-
nancial institution practices restricting
individuals from withdrawing funds
represented by checks deposited to
their accounts.

5302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to resume consider-
ation of those matters and programs
in the President's budget for fiscal
year 1983 which fall within the Com-
mittee's jurisdiction with a view toward
submitting its views and budgetary
recommendations to the Committee
on the Budget by March 15.

4232 Dirksen Building

Special on Aging
To hold hearings on problems associated with the Medicare reimbursement system for hospitals.
Room to be announced

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Social Security Administration and refugee programs, Department of Health and Human Services.
1224 Dirksen Building

Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.
6202 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to continue consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
4200 Dirksen Building

Finance
To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.
2221 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Select on Intelligence
To continue closed hearings on the proposed budget estimates for the intelligence community.
S-407, Capitol

Select on Intelligence
Budget Subcommittee
To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

1:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Health Resources Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.
1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, and the Farm Credit Administration.
1318 Dirksen Building

Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.
6202 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
To continue closed hearings on the proposed budget estimates for the intelligence community.
S-407, Capitol

Select on Intelligence
Budget Subcommittee
To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

MARCH 11

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to review the President's proposals on New Federalism.
3302 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2109, authorizing funds for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.
324 Russell Building

Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Economic Research Service, Statistical Reporting Service, World Agricultural Outlook Board, Office of the Secretary, departmental administration, Office of Governmental and Public Affairs, and the Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture.
1318 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Earthquake Hazard Reduction Act (Public Law 95-124).
235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S.1748, exempting certain employers from withdrawal and plan termination insurance provisions of title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA).
4232 Dirksen Building

Small Business
To hold hearings on the Small Business Administration's surety bond guarantee loan program.
424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the Panama Canal Commission, Research and Special Program Administration of the Department of Transportation, and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.
1224 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).
4200 Dirksen Building

Finance
To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.
2221 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on H.R. 3731, extending the period of time, in which the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare and submit to Congress a plan for the use and distribution of Indian judgment funds, within one year after appropriation; to be followed by a business meeting, to consider those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
424 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.
6202 Dirksen Building

3:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the Department of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 12

8:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Reserved Water Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2133, providing for the redevelopment of the Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Area in Washington.
3110 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Agency Administration Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Labor and Human Resources on S. 1483, making the U.S. Government liable for damages to residents and participants arising from the fallout from certain atmospheric tests, establishing an advisory panel to study the adverse health effects, and transferring from the Deon S. 1483, making the U.S. Government liable for damages to residents and participants arising from the fallout from certain atmospheric tests, establishing an advisory panel to study the adverse health effects, and transferring from the Department of Energy.
4232 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Agency Administration on S. 1483,

making the U.S. Government liable for damages to residents and participants arising from the fallout from certain atmospheric tests, establishing an advisory panel to study the adverse health effects, and transferring from the Deon S. 1483, making the U.S. Government liable for damages to residents and participants arising from the fallout from certain atmospheric tests, establishing an advisory panel to study the adverse health effects, and transferring from the Department of Energy.

4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the U.S. Special Trade Representative, Legal Services Corporation, and the Civil Rights Commission.

S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Consumer Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation unifying and clarifying the product liability tort law.

235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the office of Inspector General and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation of the Department of Transportation, and the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board.

1318 Dirksen Building

Budget

To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority

6202 Dirksen Building

Finance

To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.

2221 Dirksen Building

MARCH 15

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for the Railroad Financial Assistance Program, Department of Transportation.

235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on S. 2036, H.R. 5320, and H.R. 5461, bills providing for State and local employment and training assistance programs, and on other related measures.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the National Transportation Safety Board.

1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for elementary and secondary education and education block grant programs, Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence

To resume closed hearings on the proposed budget estimates for the intelligence community.

S-407, Capitol

Select on Intelligence

Budget Subcommittee

To resume closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for intelligence activities of the United States.

S-407, Capitol

MARCH 16

9:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Arms Control, Oceans and International Operations, and Environment Subcommittee

Open and closed hearings on U.S. and Soviet civil defense programs.

4221 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To continue joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on S. 2036, H.R. 5320, and H.R. 5461, bills providing for State and local employment and training assistance programs, and on other related measures.

2175 Rayburn Building

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Commerce, focusing on the Office of the Secretary, general administration, and the Economic Development Administration.

S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Labor and Human Resources on S. 1929, proposed Comprehensive Smoking Prevention Education Act of 1981.

4232 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

6226 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Trans-

portation on S. 1929, proposed Comprehensive Smoking Prevention Education Act of 1981.

4232 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the extended family.

3110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the Office of Revenue Sharing (New York City loan program).

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for impact aid, vocational and adult education, libraries and learning resources programs, Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business and meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).

4200 Dirksen Building

Finance

To hold hearings to review the Administration's tax proposals for fiscal year 1983.

2221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

To resume hearings to review the President's proposals on New Federalism.

3302 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1894, permitting Indian tribes to enter certain agreements for the disposition of tribal mineral resources.

357 Russell Building

11:30 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of James L. George, of Maryland, to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Multilateral Affairs, Robert T. Grey, Jr., of Virginia, to be Deputy Director, and Norman Terrell, of California, to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Nuclear Weapons Control, all of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

4221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for education for the handicapped, rehabilitation services and handicapped research programs, Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 17

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

1224 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To continue joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on S. 2036, H.R. 5320, and H.R. 5461, bills providing for State and local employment and training assistance programs, and on other related measures.

2175 Rayburn Building

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, International Trade Administration, and the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration.

S-146, Capitol

*Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal years 1983 and 1984 for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce.

235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1748, exempting certain employers from withdrawal and plan termination insurance provisions of title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA).

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for student financial assistance, student loan insurance, higher and continuing education, higher education facilities loan and insurance, college housing loans, educational research and training activities overseas, Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

Finance

To continue hearings to review the Administration's tax proposals for fiscal year 1983.

2221 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1858, declaring that the United States holds in trust certain lands in Nevada for the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, and providing for the transfer of certain other lands in Nevada to the U.S. Forest Service, H.R. 4364, declaring that the United States holds in trust certain land in Pima County, Ariz., for the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and the Department of Interior's proposed plan for the use and distribution of Wichita and Caddo

Indian judgment funds awarded by the U.S. Court of Claims.

6226 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Institute of Education, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), and education statistics, Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 18

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for conservation programs of the Department of Energy.

1224 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To continue joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on S. 2036, H.R. 5320, and H.R. 5461, bills providing for State and local employment and training assistance programs, and on other related measures.

4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Office of Transportation, Agricultural Cooperative Service, and the Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Patent and Trademark Office, Scientific and Technical Research Service, and the Minority Business Development Administration.

S-146, Capitol

*Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Federal Trade Commission, and on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal Trade Commission.

235 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings, in closed session, on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for special institutions, Howard University, departmental management (salaries and expenses), and the Office for Civil Rights, Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clear Air Act (P.L. 95-95).

4200 Dirksen Building

Finance

To continue hearings to review the Administration's tax proposals for fiscal year 1983.

2221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

To resume hearings to review the President's proposals on New Federalism.

3302 Dirksen Building

MARCH 19

9:30 a.m.

*Commerce, Science and Transportation

To continue oversight hearings on activities of the Federal Trade Commission, and on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal Trade Commission.

235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To hold hearings on productivity in the American economy.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Finance

To continue hearings to review the Administration's tax proposals for fiscal year 1983.

2221 Dirksen Building

MARCH 22

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Communications Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of Commerce.

235 Russell Building

MARCH 23

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Holocaust Memorial Council, and the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior.

1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Food and Nutrition Service, and the Human Nutrition Information Service, Department of Agriculture.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Bureau of the Census, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, and the Economic and Statistical Analysis.

S-146, Capitol

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the statute of limitations relating to Indian affairs.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Veterans' Administration.

1224 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (P.L. 95-95).

4200 Dirksen Building

MARCH 24

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Helsinki Commission, Board for International Broadcasting, Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the International Communication Agency.

S-146, Capitol

Government Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the Internal Revenue Service's taxpayer assistance programs.

3302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration of the Department of Transportation, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

1318 Dirksen Building

MARCH 25

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of Indian Education, Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission, and the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.

1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, and the Office of Rural Development Policy, Department of Agriculture.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain international organizations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the Chrysler Loan Board.

S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for the Federal Highway Administration of the Department of Transportation, and the Office of the Secretary of Transportation.

1224 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).

4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review overall budget proposals for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Agriculture.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 26

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the role of the Federal Government in the operation of U.S. payment systems.

5302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To resume hearings on productivity in the American economy.

4232 Dirksen Building

MARCH 29

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for the Civil Aeronautics Board.

1318 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review proposed authorizations for the safe drinking water program.

4200 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review budget proposals for energy conservation programs of the Department of Energy.

3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Foreign Agricultural Service, food-for-

peace program (Public Law 480), Office of International Cooperation and Development, Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Federal Grain Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture.

1318 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources

Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of sex education programs.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for the U.S. Coast Guard of the Department of Transportation.

1224 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).

4200 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Veterans Affairs

To hold hearings to receive Veterans of Foreign Wars legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1983.

318 Russell Building

MARCH 31

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for strategic petroleum reserve and naval petroleum reserves of the Department of Energy.

1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on activities of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation.

235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for certain health programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee

To continue hearings to review proposed authorizations for the safe drinking water program.

4200 Dirksen Building

APRIL 1

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and to review budget proposals for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of Inspector General, Department of Agriculture.

1318 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family, and Human Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on promoting volunteerism in America.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Selective Service System.

1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for the U.S. Railway Association, and Conrail.

S-128, Capitol

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of indirect costs and contract provisions of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (Public Law 93-638).

6226 Dirksen Building

APRIL 2

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To resume hearings on productivity in the American economy.

4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 13

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the railroad safety program, Department of Transportation.

235 Russell Building

APRIL 14

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Supreme Court, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Maritime Com-

mission, and the Federal Trade Commission.

S-146, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources
 To hold oversight hearings on the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 15

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to receive testimony from congressional witnesses.

1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Judiciary, International Trade Commission, and the Marine Mammal Commission.

S-146, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources
 To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for the National Science Foundation.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Council on Environmental Quality.

1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the tribally controlled community college program.

6226 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 16

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To resume hearings on productivity in the American economy.

4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 20

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain functions of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, and the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of State, focusing on the Office of the Secretary and administration of foreign affairs.

S-146, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources
 Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for health programs and the National Science Foundation.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Environmental Protection Agency.

1224 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
 Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Labor.

1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 21

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Small Business Administration, Federal Communications Commission, and the Maritime Administration.

S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for

fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the Federal Railroad Administration of the Department of Transportation, and Amtrak.

1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 22

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain functions of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain related programs.

S-146, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources

Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of Title X of the Public Health Service Act relating to the health aspects of teenage sexual activity.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Labor-Management Services Administration, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and the Employment Standards Administration, Department of Labor.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplement appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration of the Department of Transportation.

1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor.

1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 23

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for Bureau of Labor Statistics, departmental management services, and the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Department of Labor.

1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 26

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the Federal Aviation Administration of the Department of Transportation.

1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 27

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of the Federal Inspector, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System, Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior, and the National Endowment for the Arts.

1318 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Science Foundation.

1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 28

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings to receive testimony from Congressional and public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for certain transportation programs.

1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 29

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for fossil research and development and fossil construction programs of the Department of Energy.

1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on community social support systems.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings to receive testimony from Congressional and public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 on certain transportation programs.

1224 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Veterans Affairs

To hold hearings to receive AMVETS legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1982.

Room to be announced

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 30

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings to receive testimony from congressional and public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for certain transportation programs.

1318 Dirksen Building

MAY 3

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 4

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the

Smithsonian Institution, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 5

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 6

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, and the National Capital Planning Commission.

1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 7

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings to receive testimony from congressional witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 11

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Endowment for the Humanities, Institute of Museum Services, and the Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior.

1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Institute of Building Sciences, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and National Credit Union Administration.

1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 13

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for territorial affairs of the Department of the Interior.

1114 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for territorial affairs of the Department of the Interior.

1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 18

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

1224 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of Indian education programs.

6226 Dirksen Building

MAY 19

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.

1224 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To continue oversight hearings on the implementation of Indian education programs.

6226 Dirksen Building

MAY 24

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 25

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To receive testimony from public witness on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

1224 Dirksen Building

JUNE 9

9:30 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on proposed legislation providing for the appointment of special magistrates to serve each Indian reservation over which the United States exercises criminal jurisdiction under existing law.

6226 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 21

10:30 a.m.

Veterans Affairs

To hold hearings to receive American Legion legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1983.

318 Russell Building

CANCELLATIONS

MARCH 5

9:30 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to review the report of the Commission on Fiscal Accountability of the Department of the Interior on national energy resources.

6226 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nominations.

2228 Dirksen Building

MARCH 12

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on expanding employment opportunities for older workers.

6226 Dirksen Building

